DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 987 IR 050 848

AUTHOR	Gleaves, Edwin S.; And Others
TITLE	Information Requirements of University Faculty. An Investigation into the Information Needs, Habits, and Attitudes of the Faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University.
INSTITUTION	George Peabody Coll. for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY	Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	186p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Faculty Development; Faculty Workload; *Information Needs; *Information Seeking; Information Sources; *Library Planning; *Needs Assessment; Questionnaires; Research Needs; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; User Satisfaction (Information)
IDENTIFIERS	*George Peabody College for Teachers TN

ABSTRACT

Members of the faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers at Vanderbilt University were surveyed to discover their information needs, habits, and attitudes and to learn how the process of information gathering might influence the pace and direction of library policy. More than 60% of the 133 faculty members surveyed responded, and replies from the various professional ranks were representative of the college population at large. This report includes an introduction and background information on the survey participants, as well as analyses of data on research information needs, general information needs, personal information resources, library use, languages used in research, and informal sources. A summary provides an overview of the findings and suggestions for further study. Numerous tables and an index are included. The questionnaire, respondents' comments on the questionnaire, a selective bibliography, and a subject index are appended. (Author/THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY

An Investigation into the Information Needs, Habits, and Attitudes of the Faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University

Made Possible by a Grant from the
Council on Library Resources

Edwin S. Gleaves
Co-principal Investigator

Jordan M. Scepanski
Co-principal Investigator

Carla Mazzini
Research Associate

Department of Library and Information Science
George Peabody College for Teachers
Vanderbilt University

1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Edwin G. Gleaves

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR050848

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT
    1. Background Information
    2. Research Information Needs
    3. General Information Needs
    4. Personal Information Resources
    5. Library Use
    6. Languages Used in Research
    7. Informal Sources

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
    1. Background of the Study
    2. Methodology of the Study
    3. Document Organization
    4. A Note on the Text
    5. Acknowledgments

INTRODUCTION
    1. Definitions
    2. Reviews of Information Studies

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON SURVEY PARTICIPANTS
    1. Peabody College: A Brief Profile
    2. Degrees Offered
    3. The Peabody College Faculty
    4. Background Information on Peabody Faculty: Survey Results
    5. Age Distribution
    6. Dates of Degrees and Employment
    7. Rank Distribution
    8. Allocation of Time

SECTION II: RESEARCH INFORMATION NEEDS
    1. Research Products
    2. "Raw Materials" of Research
    3. Kinds of Information Used in Research

SECTION III: GENERAL INFORMATION NEEDS
1. Physical Formats
2. Convenience and Difficulty of Use
3. Methods of Discovery
4. Keys to Non-Book Materials
5. Citation Indexes as Sources of Information
6. Timeliness of Publication
7. Facilitation of Research

SECTION IV: PERSONAL INFORMATION RESOURCES
1. Personal Collections of Books
2. Personal Subscriptions to Professional Journals
3. Personal File Maintenance

SECTION V: LIBRARY USE
1. The Vanderbilt Library System
2. Use of the Vanderbilt Library
3. Adequacy of the Vanderbilt Library
4. Borrowing from Other Libraries
5. Sources of Materials
6. Problems in the Use of the Vanderbilt Libraries
7. Value of Library Tools
8. Accidental Discovery
9. Dates of Publication of Books and Periodicals

SECTION VI: LANGUAGES USED IN RESEARCH
1. Languages Read
2. Languages Used
3. References to Other Languages
4. Effect of Languages on Choice of Research Topic

SECTION VII: INFORMAL SOURCES
1. Methods of Exchanging Information
2. Conference Attendance
3. Value of Conferences
4. Stimuli and Sources of New Ideas for Research
6. Delegation of Research

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
1. General Observations
2. Informal Sources
3. Dominance of the Journal
4. Reliance on Printed Materials
5. Format and Use
6. Low Level of Language Use
7. Librarians in the Research Process
8. Other Findings
9. Suggestions for Further Study
10. Final Comments on the Survey

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE ON INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY

APPENDIX B: RESPONDENTS' COMMENTS ON QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX C: SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

INDEX

LIST OF TABLES

I-A Professional Degree Programs, Peabody College, 1983-84

I-B Faculty Members by Department, Peabody College, 1983-84

I-C Responses to Questionnaire by Department

I-D Age Distribution of Respondents

I-E Rank of Respondents

II-A Research Products: Likely to Result

II-B Research Products: Already Completed

II-C Research Products: Likely to Result and Already Completed

II-D Research Products: Likely to Result or Already Completed

II-E Research Products: Adjusted Frequency Between Likely to Result and Already Completed

II-F Peabody Faculty Publications, 1980-83: Number of Items

II-G Raw Materials of Research

II-H Kinds of Information Important to Research

III-A Information Needs by Physical Formats

III-B Formats According to Convenience of Use

III-C Formats According to Difficulty of Use

III-D Methods of Discovering Relevant Published Information

III-E Permissible Delays in Abstracting/Indexing Journals

III-F Facilitation of Research through Special Information Services

IV-D Personal Information Resources: Books

IV-E Personal Information Resources: Journal Subscriptions

IV-F Personal Reference Files

V-A The Vanderbilt University Libraries: The Jean and Alexander Heard Library System

V-B Use of the Vanderbilt Library System

V-C Problems in the Use of the Vanderbilt Libraries

V-D Value of Library Research Tools

V-E Means of Accidental Discovery

V-F Age of Books Required for Research

V-G Age of Journals Required for Research

VI-A Reference to Materials in Foreign Languages

VII-A Methods of Exchanging Information

VII-B Conference Attended--Last 12 Months

VII-C Value of Conference Attendance

VII-D Stimuli and Sources for Research

ABSTRACT

1 Background Information

Members of the faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University were surveyed to discover their information needs, habits, and attitudes and to learn how the process of information gathering might influence the pace and direction of library policy. Over 60 percent of the 133 faculty surveyed responded, and replies from the various professional ranks were representative of the college population at large.

Those who responded were largely between the ages of 31 and 50 and slightly more than half had been hired since 1978. Respondents indicated that they divide their work more-or-less evenly among teaching, research, and other educational activities.

2 Research Information Needs

With regard to research information needs, the faculty reported that (1) the journal is their most important research product; (2) published documents, experiment and/or observation, and the interview or questionnaire are the most used "raw materials" for research, and (3) conceptual, statistical, and methodological information are considered most important to their research. While the journal article is seen as the product most likely to result from current research, the conference paper is the most common item actually completed.

3 General Information Needs

For general information needs, the Peabody faculty rely most heavily upon print materials--especially periodicals and books--and much less on microforms, theses, audiovisual materials, and other "problem formats." Apparently the faculty associate convenience of use of a given type of material with its importance. Personal contacts with colleagues are seen as important avenues for obtaining information, while the librarian is not viewed as a significant source.

Scanning journals, abstracts, and indexes is the most popular way of discovering references to relevant published information. When questioned about the importance of timely access to published information, most of the faculty put a high value on early access to the most recent information and little value on information appearing in an indexing or abstracting journal more than six months after publication. Despite the faculty's markedly traditional approach to information gathering, they appear to be receptive to changes that might be brought about through new types of information services.

4 Personal Information Resources

When asked about their personal information resources that are directly related to their research and teaching, the faculty indicated that, on the average, they own 300 volumes or less and subscribe to five or fewer journals. Personal reference files are most often maintained on index cards or in photocopy files rather than in electronic form.

5 Library Use

In the area of library use, the faculty indicated that they normally enter one or more units of the Vanderbilt University libraries four to five times per month. The Education Library, as might be expected, is the most used, with the Central Library a clear second. Both the Medical and the Science libraries receive a fair amount of use, followed by the Management Library. The other six libraries are visited infrequently.

In terms of adequacy of the collections, the university libraries were rated from moderate to high for both teaching and research, with little borrowing from non-Vanderbilt libraries. Problems identified with library use centered on the unavailability of items--either because they are not owned or because they are missing or circulating--and the length of time it takes to obtain an item on interlibrary loan. Most faculty believe that they are reasonably able to resolve these difficulties and do not see them as extremely serious.

When queried about the value of certain library research tools, the faculty expressed a preference for traditional print materials rather than data stored electronically, but demonstrated a definite interest in online indexing and abstracting services. Accidental discovery in research occurs most often through scanning periodicals, looking up given references and spotting something else in the process, and through conversations with colleagues. Browsing through library stacks is seen of be of moderate value in the research process. Virtually all of those responding expressed the view that the more recent the publication--be it book or journal--the more often it is required for research.

6 Languages Used in Research

The vast majority of the Peabody faculty do not use foreign-language materials in their research and appear to make little attempt to find translations or summaries of works they encounter in other languages. Even so, the large majority indicate that they perceive no problem in their research because of language barriers or difficulties.

7 Informal Sources

The most common informal sources of information include exchanging information with colleagues at other institutions through social contacts, written correspondence, and exchange of offprints. Most faculty members attend one or more conferences a year, with over 80 percent attending at least one national conference. The information obtained at conferences is seen as having high value, with informal contacts as the most important single source.

New ideas for research are most often obtained through the research process itself and through reading, followed by discussions with colleagues--a source of information that appears in various sections of this study. Searching for references or materials is frequently delegated to others, most often to graduate assistants.

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1 Background of the Study

This study was conceived in the curiosity of a library practitioner and a library educator who had long wondered about how and why people use information. We had wondered less about why people need information, agreeing with Geoffrey Ford that, given a broad enough definition of information and user, "it seems unlikely that there are many non-users in the world."[1]

The practitioner had done some studies on library use, the educator on reading and reading interests. It remained for us to combine our interests and to undertake a study of the information needs, habits, and attitudes of a subject group, the most obvious and available one being the 100 or so faculty of

---

1. Geoffrey Ford, ed., User Studies: An Introductory Guide and Select Bibliography (Sheffield: Centre for Research and User Studies, University of Sheffield, 1977), p. 2.

Peabody College of Vanderbilt University. To undertake such a project, however, would require some outside support, so in March 1983 we applied to the Council on Library Resources for a grant from its Professional Education and Training for Research Librarianship (PETREL) program. The proposal was approved and in July 1983 the first stage of our project entitled "Information Requirements of University Faculty" got under way.

2 Methodology for the Study

One of the first moves during the grant period was to form a small PETREL Grant Advisory Committee composed Mary Beth Blalock, director of the Peabody Education Library of the Vanderbilt University Library, J. Michael Rothacker, associate professor of library and information science, Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, and the two principal investigators. During this developmental period in the research project, a research associate, Carla Mazzini, was contracted to work for the period covered by the grant from the Council on Library Resources. Through additional assistance from the Vanderbilt University Library, Ms. Mazzini was able to stay with the project for a few months beyond the contract period, adding greatly to our capacity to deal with the massive amount of information being generated from the questionnaires.

Through funds from the CLR grant, we were able to engage a computer analyst, Arthur Lowitzer, a graduate student in special education, who gave order to the mass of data through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Through further assistance from the library system, still another graduate student, Linda Turnbo, from the Department of Library and Information Science, helped input the data into Vanderbilt's Digital Equipment Corporation Model 1099 mainframe computer, through which the SPSS program was processed.

One of Ms. Mazzini's first projects was to undertake a substantial literature review, no mean task in the area of user studies--with special attention given to the studies carried out at the Bath University Library in 1971 and the Centre for Research on User Studies, University of Sheffield, in 1978. The bibliography she developed (Appendix C) was invaluable in getting a grasp on the formative studies in this area, and it was to these studies that we turned to develop the questionnaire that was to be distributed to the Peabody faculty. It should prove equally valuable to those who continue in the tradition of user studies.

The survey instrument (Appendix A) was designed to gather data concerning the background of the faculty, their research information needs, the formats they use, the use of library and personal resources, their use of foreign-language materials, their participation in informal networks, and their use of and attitudes toward new information technologies and services.

The questionnaire was based primarily on the one used in the INFROSS study at Bath University, with major modifications. In general, we tried to simplify the INFROSS questionnaire for the sake of the respondents, relying heavily upon a Likert-type scale of weighting values from 1 to 5. We did leave some room for comment, however, and found that the faculty took full advantage of such openings (and others that we did not provide) to give us their opinions. We also used ideas and questions from the Sheffield study instrument, and from a questionnaire developed at Cornell University on "Information Resources in Agricultural Research," administered in late 1983. To these studies, and the many people who made them possible, we freely acknowledge our indebtedness.

Our questionnaire was a good four months and five drafts in the making. After the three of us felt reasonably satisfied with the instrument, we asked for written comments from the members of the advisory committee, who gave us the benefit of fresh points of view. Then, in semi-final form, the questionnaire went to two pilot groups: the faculty of the Department of Library and Information Science and a similar number of colleagues in the Central Library. An analysis of their responses to the questions, and to the comments that they freely offered, led to further refinement of the questionnaire which finally went to the Peabody faculty on February 27, with a suggested return date of March 15. After that date, reminders went to all faculty with outstanding questionnaires. A personal letter from Professor Gleaves to his delinquent Peabody colleagues formed stage three of the campaign, which in all resulted in a 62.5 percent return rate and an obvious seriousness of compliance in filling out the 8-page questionnaire.

In late June 1984 Professor Gleaves presented a summary of the research project at the meeting of the Science and Technology Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) at the annual meeting of the American Library Association (ALA) in Dallas, Texas. Mr. Scepanski participated in materials preparation and was present at the presentation to answer some of the questions that inevitably arose from those attending.

3 Document Organization

The academic environment in which this study was conducted is discussed in Chapter I, along with the rate of response to the questionnaire. In that chapter we describe the college and the faculty as we knew them before the study, and then proceed to discuss what the questionnaire revealed about the faculty in the section of the questionnaire that dealt with background information. In the Introduction, we take a passing look at the voluminous literature on information needs and uses, concentrating primarily on the reviews of research that already exist. Subsequent chapters follow the numbering scheme of the questionnaire, except for the last section of text, which presents a summary of the principal findings of the study.

4 A Note on the Text

This document was prepared on a Kaypro II microcomputer using the Perfect Writer word processing program. This program has facilitated our work in a number of ways (including the generation of the index), but the computer's memory limitations (64K with 191K diskettes) have resulted in a chapter-by-chapter numbering system rather than one sequence for the entirety of the document. Some spelling errors were caught by Perfect Speller, but no spelling checker yet takes the place of careful proofreading.

5 Acknowledgments

Lest it go unsaid, we would like to express our appreciation to all of those who have made this study possible, even to those researchers who led us down this garden path of roses and thorns. To the Council on Library Resources we owe the

original possibility of finding support for the project and the ultimate support to carry it out; the PETREL program has, we believe, set many researchers such as ourselves to dreaming of projects which could, however modest the beginning, occupy a substantial part of one's adult life. To our respective administrations for their support; to Mary Beth Blalock and Mike Rothacker, our on-the-spot committee; to Chuck Lowitzer and Linda Turnbo; and to the Peabody faculty who came through for us--our sincere thanks.

Finally, our special word of thanks to Carla Mazzini, our indefatigable associate who brought her own good spirits and open mind to this open-ended project. It goes without saying that there is more to be done. Without her, we would not have gotten this far.

Edwin S. Gleaves

Jordan M. Scepanski

I would also like to add a word of thanks to my secretary, Alice Underwood, whose cheerful nature belies her critical approach to textual proofreading, of which she is a master. Whatever typographical/word processor errors remain in this text must have sneaked in after Mrs. Underwood's careful scrutiny.

E.S.G.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1 Definitions

According to T. D. Wilson, "Apart from information retrieval there is virtually no other area of information science that has occasioned as much research effort and writing as 'user studies.' Within user studies the investigation of 'information needs' has been the subject of much debate and no little confusion."[1]

Susan Crawford, in her review of information needs and uses for the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, states: "It may reasonably be estimated that, over the past 30 years, some 1000 papers on user behavior and the use of information systems have been published.[2]

---

1. T. D. Wilson, "On User Studies and Information Needs," Journal of Documentation 37 (March 1981): 3.

2. Susan Crawford, "Information Needs and Uses," in Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, ed. Martha E. Williams (White Plains, N.Y: Knowledge Industry Publications, 1978, p. 61.

Part of the difficulty in assessing information needs, as Wilson goes on to point out the obvious, "lies with the troublesome concept of 'information.'"[3] Wilson's definitions of "information" as it is often used in research studies are helpful:

> The word "information" is used, in the context of user-studies research, to denote a *physical entity* or phenomenon (as in the case of questions related to the number of books read in a period of time, the number of journals subscribed to, etc.), the *channel of communication* through which messages are transferred (as when we speak of the incidence of oral versus written information), or the *factual data*, empirically determined and presented in a document or transmitted orally.[4]

Crawford agrees that "there appears to be a consensus that 'information need' is a difficult concept to define, to isolate, and especially to measure." She goes on to point out, "An information demand or preference, expressed in relation to particular purpose, to be used within a particular environment is more easily defined." She also mentions that the largest emerging area of studies (21 percent) during the period she

---

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

reviewed (1975-77) "involved users of information in what may be called the applied social sciences--education, sociology, economics, planning, and law."[5]

It is within this more definable context that the present study has been undertaken, both in terms of the type of study (applied) and the area of investigation (education and related fields). Even so, some complexities remain in defining the nature of the study. Maurice Line, the guiding spirit behind the INFROSS study, provides some useful insights into the difficulty of precise definitions. In his summary of information needs in the social sciences, he makes a most helpful distinction among information needs, uses, and demands:

> Individuals do not use all they demand (partly because they are not always able to obtain it, partly because it may not be relevant when they obtain it), nor do they demand all they need, mainly because they are often unaware of potentially relevant information. Nor do people necessarily need all they demand, or even perhaps all they use. Most studies of information needs have actually been studies of uses, or at best of demands. The identification of needs is

---

5. Crawford, p. 62.

> in fact extremely difficult because it involves the articulation of something that the user is unable to articulate for himself.[6]

To some extent, our study rushes in where angels fear to tread, for we attempt, through the various sections of the questionnaire, to address all three of these factors: needs, uses, and demands, though we make no claim to having articulated for our respondents something that they are unable to articulate for themselves. We have attempted, in the course of the questionnaire, to make them as aware as possible of the range of information resources available to them now or in the future; through a set of conditional questions in Section III, General Information Needs, we have made a special attempt to provide a full range of opportunities to stimulate their thinking about their information needs.

2 Reviews of Information Studies

In their review of information needs and uses for 1971,

---

[6] Maurice B. Line, "Information Needs of the Social Sciences," INSPEL: International Journal of Special Libraries 8 (April 1973): 29-39.

Lin and Garvey note that "one of the most remarkable features of [the literature reporting information needs and uses in science and technology] show that systematic studies of information needs and uses have become truly international."[7]

Much the same could be said of studies in the social sciences, especially in light of the important contributions made to user studies by British researchers. Though mentioned elsewhere, we would like to highlight at this point the importance of two studies carried out in Great Britain, one at Bath University (the INFROSS study), the other at the University of Sheffield:

- Cynthia Corkill and Margaret Mann, Information Needs in the Humanities: Two Postal Surveys, CRUS Occasional Paper, no. 2 (Sheffield: Centre for Research on User Studies, University of Sheffield), 1978).
- Information Requirements of Researchers in the Social Sciences, ed. Maurice B. Line et al. Investigation into Information Requirements of the Social Sciences, Research Report no. 1, vol. 1 (Bath: Bath University Library, 1971).

Although a great deal has been done before and since these studies, nothing has quite matched their complexity and thoroughness in dealing with information needs in the social

---

7. Nan Lin and William G. Garvey, "Information Needs and Uses," in Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, ed. Carlos Cuadra, vol. 7 (Washington: American Society for Information Science, 1972), p. 5.

sciences and the humanities. Indeed, the term "since Bath," as used by Perry Morrison (q.v., cited below) seems to be an appropriate benchmark for information studies in the social sciences.

In the face of the 1,000 papers on user behavior and the use of information systems, we are moved to turn again to Maurice Line as he begins his summary article: "My aim in this paper is not to review the literature of user studies in the social sciences, since this has been ably done elsewhere."[8]

At this point Line cites the following reviews of information studies:

- J. M. Brittain, Information and Its Users: A Review, with Special Reference to the Social Sciences (Bath: Bath University Press, and New York: Wiley, 1970).
- Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, vol. 1- , 1966- .

Brittain's book, which identified eighteen studies into information needs in the social sciences, was one of the few such reviews available at the time, but ten years earlier the National Science Foundation (U.S.) had sponsored a study/review undertaken by the Bureau of Applied Social Research of Columbia University entitled Review of Studies in the Flow of Information Among Scientists (New York: Columbia University, 1960). This substantial publication identified and summarized a surprising number of information studies carried out in the sciences (in the broad sense of the word) during the 1940s and 1950s.

---

[8] Line, p. 29.

The surveys that have appeared in the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology have indeed been excellent contributions to the literature, but it would be misleading to infer from Line that the surveys on this topic appear annually. The articles we have found to be most useful in our study include those by Crawford and by Lin and Garvey (both cited above), as well as the following:

- Thomas J. Allen, "Information Needs and Uses," in Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, ed. Carlos A. Cuadra, vol. 4 (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1969), pp. 3-29.
- John Martyn, "Information Needs and Uses," in Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, ed. Carlos A. Cuadra, vol. 9 (Washington, D.C.: American Society for Information Science, 1974), pp. 3-21.

For other annual surveys on information needs and uses in the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, see the Selective Bibliography (Appendix C).

A number of the more recent reviews of studies on information needs appear in the Selective Bibliography (Appendix C). The two most illuminating of the reviews, in our judgement, are the following:

- Ford, Geoffrey, ed. User Studies: An Introductory Guide and Select Bibliography (Sheffield: Centre for Research on User Studies, 1977).
- Perry D. Morrison, "Since Bath: A Review of Published Information Transfer Studies in the Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1975 through 1978," Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian 1 (Fall 1979): 5-22.

The Ford volumes provides a very useful introduction to user studies in general, covering such areas as the objectives of research on users of information, concept definition and analysis of research findings, user systems, purposes for which information is sought, problem areas in the information industry, and methods and techniques of research on user studies. Morrison's article, while covering only a few years, uncovers a wealth of information and cites over 75 user studies, most of which fall into the time period "since Bath."

A companion study in the field of history is worth noting:

- Margaret F. Stieg, "The Information Needs of Historians," College and Research Libraries 42 (November 1981): 549-60.

Stieg points out that a previous survey had "revealed that social scientists were less aware of library services and more critical of librarian's performance than were the humanists." In placing social scientists as subjects of user studies, she cites Line, in the Bath study, who has suggested that "information needs of social scientists are hard to satisfy because the social sciences are less stable, lack clear boundaries, and use imprecise terminology."

Other recent studies that we have found particularly helpful in the present study are the following:

- N. Ford, "Relating "Information Needs' to Learner Characteristics in Higher Education," Journal of Documentation 36 (June 1980): 99-114.
- Patricia Stenstrom and Ruth B. McBride, "Serial Use by Social Science Faculty: A Survey," College and Research Libraries 40 (September 1979): 425-31.
- Stephen K. Stoan, "Research and Library Skills: An Analysis and Interpretation," College and Research Libraries 45 (March 1984): 99-109.
- T. D. Wilson, "On User Studies and Information Needs," Journal of Documentation 37 (March 1981): 3-15.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

1 Peabody College: A Brief Profile

Peabody College, since 1979 a professional school of Vanderbilt University, traces its lineage to Davidson Academy, organized in 1785, ten years before the state of Tennessee was founded. It took its name from America's great educational philanthropist, George Peabody, in 1875, and moved to its present location in 1914.

For over a century, Peabody College has been recognized as one of the nation's foremost colleges of teacher education. The Peabody tradition grew from the excellence of its academic programs and the quality of its graduates, who serve in elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities, libraries and information centers, and state departments and national ministries of education in this country and abroad.

The current enrollment of Peabody College of Vanderbilt

University is about 1,300 students, more than half of whom are enrolled in post-baccalaureate professional degree programs preparing for careers as classroom teachers and professionals in other areas related to education and human development.

The college offers the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree and the following professional degrees: Master of Education (M.Ed.), Master of Library Science (M.L.S.), Specialist in Education (Ed.S.), and Doctor of Education (Ed.D.). The M.S. and the Ph.D. degrees are offered by the Vanderbilt Graduate School through Peabody departments.

The college itself is divided into six academic departments:

- Educational Leadership
- Human Development Counseling
- Library and Information Science
- Psychology and Human Development
- Special Education
- Teaching and Learning

2 Degrees Offered

Peabody College offers the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) with majors in elementary education, secondary education, special education, physical education, and human development. In addition, Peabody provides the professional education components for students in the College of Arts and Science who are preparing for certification as secondary school teachers.

The M.S. and Ph.D. degrees are offered in (1) Education and Human Development and (2) Psychology and Human Development. Professional degrees are offered in a number of areas, as listed in Table I-A.

TABLE I-A

PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS, PEABODY COLLEGE, 1983-84

Major	Degree	Department*
College Stud. Personnel Services	M.Ed.	DEL
Curriculum and Supervision	M.Ed.	DEL
Early Childhood Education	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DTL
Elementary Education	M.Ed.	DTL
English Education	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DTL
Gen. Administrative Leadership	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DEL
Higher Education	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DEL
Human Development	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DPHD
Human Development Counseling	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DHDC
Human Resource Development	M.Ed.	DTL
Institutional Advancement	M.Ed.	DEL
Library and Information Science	M.L.S., Ed.S.	DLIS
Mathematics Education	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DTL
Physical Education	M.Ed.	DTL
Policy Development and Program Evaluation	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DEL
Program and Staff Development	Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DEL
Psychology	M.Ed.,Ed.D.	DPHD
Reading Education	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ph.D.	DTL
Science Education	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ph.D.	DTL
School Administration	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ph.D.	DEL
Secondary School Teaching	M.Ed.	DTL
Social Studies Education	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DTL
Special Education	M.Ed.,Ed.S.,Ed.D.	DSE

* Key to abbreviations:

DEL	Department of Educational Leadership
DHDC	Department of Human Development Counseling
DLIS	Department of Library and Information Science
DPHD	Department of Psychology and Human Development
DSE	Department of Special Education
DTL	Department of Teaching and Learning

3 The Peabody College Faculty

Peabody College, then, is a college of education and human development, with strong programs in education to prepare pre-service and in-service students for careers in a broad spectrum of education practice and equally strong programs in psychology and human development. In addition, the college includes a graduate program in library and information science that is accredited by the American Library Association.

Historically, the programs (and faculty) in education, human development counseling, and library and information science have been more practice-oriented, while those in psychology and human development and in special education have been more research oriented--although research and publications are more heavily stressed throughout the college now than they were before the merger with Vanderbilt University. The sizes of the six departments are not necessarily reflected by the number of programs offered by those departments, as can been seen in Table I-B. Special Education, for example, which offers only one program, is one of the larger departments. The largest department in the college is Psychology and Human Development, with 32 regular faculty members, followed by the Department of

Educational Leadership (23), the Department of Teaching and Learning (22), and the Department of Special Education (21). It might be noted that the Department of Teaching and Learning now incorporates the faculty in physical education, who comprised a separate department until two years ago.

TABLE I-B

FACULTY MEMBERS BY DEPARTMENT, PEABODY COLLEGE, 1983-84

Dept.	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Assis. Prof.	Instr.	Other	Total
DEL	15	4	3	1		23
DHDC	1	2	3			6
DLIS	1	4			2	7
DPHD	14	10	7	1		32
DSE	7	6	7		1	21
DTL	8	7	7			22
Total	46	33	27	2	3	111

SOURCE: The Bulletin of Vanderbilt University, 1983-84: George Peabody College for Teachers

NOTE: These numbers do not agree with those to whom the questionnaire was distributed, for at least two reasons: (1) some faculty hold joint appointments and are listed in more than one department; and (2) in addition to regular faculty, the questionnaire was sent to part-time and adjunct faculty, most of whom are not listed in the college bulletin from which this table was compiled.

To what extent this educational configuration can be called "typical" of colleges of education in this country is difficult to say. We suspect that, given the changing nature of colleges of education, no one school could claim to be typical in any absolute sense. However, the Peabody faculty are probably representative of their counterparts in other colleges of education within research-oriented universities. We are cautious about drawing hasty generalizations; we simply state our findings based on data collected from Peabody faculty. Our findings and conclusions are limited to the Peabody College faculty in all their diversity and uniqueness.

4 Background Information on Peabody Faculty: Survey Results

Questionnaires were sent to the 133 members of the Peabody faculty who are maintained on the Peabody dean's mailing list. These include all regular, full-time faculty, as well as part-time and adjunct faculty. A total of 83 completed questionnaires were returned, resulting in a return rate of 62.5 percent. All departments were represented, as can be seen in

Table I-C. In fact, the return rate was well over 50 percent of the regular faculty in each department except the Department of Special Education.[1]

---

[1] The researchers assumed that the more research-oriented departments would be the best to respond to such a survey, which did not seem to hold true in this case. By the same token, the Department of Educational Leadership, not one of the more active departments in terms of research, had a high rate of response.

TABLE I-C

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY DEPARTMENT

Department	No. in Dept.*	% Total	No. Resp.	% Resp.
Educational Leadership (DEL)	26	19.4	18	21.7
Human Development Counseling (DHDC)	6	4.5	3	3.6
Library and Information Science (DLIS)	7**	5.2	5	6.0
Psychology and Human Development (DPHD)	37	27.6	27	32.5
Special Education (DSE)	21	15.7	9	10.8
Teaching and Learning (DTL)	37***	27.6	21	25.3
Total			83	100.0

* According to mailing list of faculty maintained in the dean's office. Does not agree with 1983-84 Bulletin, as reflected in previous table.

** Includes one of the principal investigators in the research project, who did not fill out a questionnaire.

*** See comments in text about part-time and adjunct faculty.

5 Age Distribution of Peabody Faculty

Respondents were asked to indicate their age group by marking one of five ten-year periods provided on the questionnaire. As shown in Table I-D, the great majority of the faculty (72.8%) are somewhere between the ages of 31 and 50, with roughly half of this majority falling into the decade of their thirties, the other half in their forties. The next largest group (14.8%) is represented by those in their fifties.

6 Dates of Degrees and Employment

Respondents were asked to give the year they obtained their terminal degrees, the year they were first employed as teachers or researchers in higher education, and the year they were employed in their departments. Responses to these first two questions were scattered and showed no particular pattern. For example, the years of receipt of terminal degrees range from 1941 to 1983. The period from the mid-sixties through the later seventies shows a slight yearly increase in number of those receiving degrees, but these results seem in keeping with the ages of the population at large. The range of years of initial employment as a teacher or researcher are identical: from 1941 to 1983. Although the distribution within this range is not identical to the terminal degree grouping, no particular period stands out as one of intensive hiring.

TABLE I-D

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

Age Range	No. Responses	Adjusted % Respondents
21-30 years	3	3.7
31-40	29	35.8
41-50	30	37.0
51-60	12	14.8
60-	7	8.0
Total	81*	99.9

* Two persons did not answer this question.

Of these three questions, the year employed in the department reveals a more discernible pattern by showing more hiring activity in departments from 1978 to the present than anytime prior to 1978. Indeed, the data show a fact that probably has not been generally recognized--that over half (54.9%) of the faculty members responding have been hired since 1978. The year 1983 as initial date of employment in a Peabody department stands out from the rest, accounting for 15.9 percent of those responding. If the respondents can be assumed to be a fair cross-section of the Peabody faculty, then these data suggest the wholesale reconstitution of the Peabody faculty over the last six years, of which five have come and gone since the merger with Vanderbilt University.

7 Rank Distribution

Questions concerning rank and year of appointment to rank elicited responses that are clearly descriptive of the population. As Table I-E shows, 37.3 percent of the respondents are full professors and 27.7 percent associate professors. The survey population is weighted toward senior faculty, reflecting quite closely the entire faculty--44.4 percent of the regular faculty reported in Table I-B are full professors and 29.7 percent associate professors.

With respect to the years the respondents were appointed to their current ranks, 79.7 percent received their appointments between 1975 and 1983. The years of greatest concentration were 1978 (16.5%) and 1983 (17.7%).

TABLE I-E

RANK OF RESPONDENTS

Rank	No. Responses	% Respondents
Professor	31	37.3
Associate Professor	23	27.7
Assistant Professor	14	16.9
Instructor	1	1.2
Lecturer	5	6.0
Adjunct Professor	3	3.6
Adjunct Associate Professor	1	1.2
Adjunct Assistant Professor	3	3.6
Research Associate Professor	2	2.4
Total	83	99.9

8 Allocation of Time

The last question in this background section asked the participants to indicate what percentage of their time they spent in teaching (including class preparation), research, and other activities (which they were asked to specify).

Allocation of faculty time was fairly evenly divided among the three activities: with respective means of 35.8 percent for teaching, 28.5 percent for research, and 30.8 percent for other (which included administration, committee memberships, and similar faculty responsbilities). Medians were similar, registering 32.7 percent, 25.2 percent, and 25.7 percent respectively.

Viewed a bit more closely, approximately half of the respondents (52.5%) spent no more than one-third of their time in class preparation, instruction, and other teaching duties. One third of the group, however, spent from 50 to 100 percent of their time on teaching activities.

With respect to research, one quarter of the respondents indicated that they spent 10 percent or less of their time in research. About half of the respondents devoted 15 to 40 percent of their time to research, and the final quarter spent 50 percent or more of their time in research.

As for the other activities, a quarter of the respondents spend 10 percent or less of their time in this area; half of them were occupied in other activities from 15 to 45 percent of the time; and the final quarter of the respondents spent 50 percent of the time engaged in other activities.

Whatever else may be said concerning how faculty spend their time, one is struck by the comments indicating how many faculty claim to spend their time in administration. Taking into account that the Peabody faculty include five deans and six department chairs, along with administrators of a few institutes, no less than 14 of the 83 faculty responding (16.7%) said that they spend 50 percent or more of their time in administration, and 10 (12%) said that they devote 70 percent or more of their time to administrative responsibilities. Some of those responsibilities may well be research related, but other faculty members may well find themselves involved in various levels of departmental administration. In any case, these figures suggest the difficulty of viewing many faculty as full-time in the instructional program when in reality they find themselves caught up in administration to a surprising degree.

SECTION II: RESEARCH INFORMATION NEEDS

1 Research products

Part II of the questionnaire dealt with the types of research normally undertaken by the Peabody faculty and the materials needed for that research. Those responding to the questionnaire were asked to focus on research projects which they were working on at the time or had recently completed.

The first of the three questions addressed the issue of the products likely to result, or thosed that had recently resulted, from faculty research. Faculty were asked to check the products (book, article, conference paper, etc.) "likely to result" from their research and/or "already completed." The responses were analyzed in the following ways: percentage of respondents who checked the blanks indicating that certain products are "likely to result" (Table II-A); that they are "already completed" (Table II-B); that they are both likely to result and already completed (Table II-C); and that they are likely to result or already completed (Table II-D).[1]

---

[1] Because of the problems of interpretation associated with the "thesis for higher degree," this research product has been dropped from our analysis and does not appear in the tables.

TABLE II-A

RESEARCH PRODUCTS: LIKELY TO RESULT

Product	%/Respondents
Journal article	71.6
Conference paper	50.7
Contribution to a book	44.8
Book for which you are an author	34.3
Other publication of which you are an editor	17.9
Other	6.0
Edition or translation of another author's work	3.0

TABLE II-B

RESEARCH PRODUCTS: ALREADY COMPLETED

Product	%/Respondents
Conference paper	52.2
Journal article	46.3
Contribution to a book	37.4
Book for which you are an author	20.9
Other publication of which you are an editor	12.0
Other	6.0
Edition or translation of another author's work	3.0

TABLE II-C

RESEARCH PRODUCTS: LIKELY TO RESULT AND ALREADY COMPLETED

Product	%/Respondents
Journal article	20.9
Conference paper	17.9
Contribution to a book	9.0
Book for which you are an author	3.0
Other publication of which you are an editor	3.0
Edition or translation of another author's work	1.5
Other	0.0

TABLE II-D

RESEARCH PRODUCTS: LIKELY TO RESULT OR ALREADY COMPLETED

Product	%/Respondents
Journal article	97.0
Conference paper	85.0
Contribution to a book	73.2
Book for which you are an author	52.2
Other publication of which you are an editor	26.9
Other	12.0
Edition or translation of another author's work	4.5

On this basis, the journal article appears to be the most popular form of publication, with 97 percent of the respondents indicating that research currently under way or recently completed is likely to result or has already resulted in such a product (Table II-D). The conference paper was ranked second (85%), contribution to a book third (73.2%), and authoring a book fourth (52.2%).

Clearly, the journal article is the most favored scholarly research form, at least if expected performance is the measure. Almost three-fourths (71.6%) of the respondents reported that a journal article is likely to result from their research, and 46.3 percent said they had already completed one or more articles. However, the most popular form in terms of actual achievement is the conference paper, with 52.2 percent reporting having completed such a paper. Next in the list of products already completed was the journal article (46.3 %), followed by contribution to a book (37.4%), authorship of a book (17.9%), and editing a publication (9.0%).

The differences among some of the tables are worth exploring further. An interesting comparison can be made between the level of expectation (as reflected in Table II-A) and that of achievement (Table II-B). This disparity can be seen in Table II-E, which records the adjusted frequency differences between these two sets of responses.

TABLE II-E

RESEARCH PRODUCTS: ADJUSTED FREQUENCY BETWEEN LIKELY TO RESULT AND ALREADY COMPLETED

Product	%/Difference
Journal article	25.3
Book for which you are an author	13.4
Contribution to a book	7.4
Other publication of which you are an editor	5.9
Edition or translation of another author's work	0.0
Other	---
Conference paper	-1.5

The greatest adjusted frequency disparity exists between journal articles likely to result and those already completed. Some 50.7 percent reported that an article is likely to result from their research, while 25.4 percent reported that one already has, a difference of 25.3. The adjusted frequency difference between having authored a book and expecting to do so is 13.4 percent. Only one product--the conference paper--shows actual past production to be greater than present expectation, and two--edition or translation of another author's work and the category "other"--reveals the same for both likelihood and completion.

These differences might be attributed to a common human characteristic--hope for greater productivity. That the conference paper does not follow suit is probably indicative of the value relative to other research products that most scholars place upon it. One can surmise that the exigencies of presenting a paper at a conference provide little room for procrastination or reordering priorities, events more likely with articles or books. The relatively low expectation that a conference paper is likely to result from current research (32.8%) is probably indicative of the value set on the conference paper as an end product--although the expectations of contributing to a book and authoring a book are almost identical on the scale.

Whereas over half (52.2%) of the respondents have either completed a book or expect to do so, only 20.9 percent indicate that they have already completed one. In interpreting this result, however, we must take into account the questionnaire directions emphasizing recent publications and should not conclude from these data that only 20.9 percent of the faculty have ever authored a book.

A contribution to a book was one of the most likely products of the Peabody faculty member's research. About three-quarters (73.2%) have contributed, or expect to contribute, to a book. This type of publication was the third most likely product expected to result from their research (44.8%) and the third highest research product achieved (37%), with a relatively low differential between the two.

Producing an edition or translation of another author's work is apparently a rare activity among the Peabody faculty, with but three individuals indicating either expectation or completion. A surprisingly low number showed activity as an editor of some other type of publication; only 17.9 percent said such a publication was likely to result and 12.0 percent indicated that such a work had been completed.

The "other" option at the end of the question provided the respondents with the opportunity to indicate unlisted products expected to result or having already resulted from their research. The investigators were surprised, in retrospect, that only one faculty member mentioned a research report (presumably to a government agency), since this is a common product that was not mentioned in the questionnaire. Similarly, one professor mentioned a national report to the U.S. Secretary of Education. Other products included a technical report, media product, policy report, and position paper--as well as class preparation. (See Appendix C for complete list.)

As a means of comparison, the investigators did a brief analysis of recent publication of the Peabody faculty, as listed in the annual compilation Publications of the Faculty [of Vanderbilt University]. We found it useful to examine the number of publications by Peabody faculty over the three-year period preceding the administration of the questionnaire (a period that might reasonably be viewed as "recent") to determine (1) the number and types of publications of the Peabody faculty. Table II-F reflects those findings.

These figures reveal a total output of 518 publications over the three-year period, or an average of 173 per year. Using the average of 125 faculty members (including adjunct faculty) over that time period, the faculty produced about 1.4 publications per person per year. Of those publications, 274 (52.9%) were journal articles, 93 (18%) were contributions to books, 25 (4.8%) were published conference papers, 21 (4.1%) were books, and 95 (18.3%) were classified as "other."

In this listing we have included one type of publication that does not appear in the questionnaire: reviews. While these are normally not considered research per se, it can be argued that scholarly reviews do require a certain amount of research and study that should not be ignored in assessing the total scholarly output of the faculty. In the "other" category, 74 (78%) were reviews, although it should be pointed out that 61 (64.2%) of those reviews were contributed by faculty in the Department of Library and Information Science.

TABLE II-F

PEABODY FACULTY PUBLICATIONS, 1980-83: NUMBER OF ITEMS

Dept.	Book	Cont Book	Ed/tran other	Edit	Jour Art	Conf Paper	Other **	Total
DEL	5	9	0	1	61	2	15	93
DHDC	0	3	0	0	9	2	4	18
DLIS	1	4	1	2	20	2	61	91
DPHD	5	45	0	6	113	7	6	182
DSE	1	15	0	0	60	6	3	85
DTL*	9	15	0	0	13	6	6	49
Total	21	93	1	9	274	25	95	518

---

*Includes Health and Physical Education faculty for the years 1980-81 and 1981-82 (now a part of the department).

**"Other" includes the following: reviews (74), technical reports (6), video tapes (4), scripts (2), tapescripts (2), ERIC documents (2), tests (2), and audio tape (1).

2 "Raw Materials" of Research

The second question in this section on research information needs dealt with the "raw materials" of research, a question deriving almost directly from the Bath study. Respondents were asked to rate, according to the importance to their research, the materials that may be considered "raw materials," in some fields primary materials, of their research.

In rating the seven choices on a five-point importance scale, the Peabody faculty gave the highest mean score to published documents (4.5) and the lowest to mathematical model or computer simulation (1.8). (Tabulation of the responses by mean appear as Table II-G.) The only new material mentioned in the "other" category was product specifications/technical product data (see Appendix C).

A clear break appears between "interview/questionnaire" and "computer data tapes." It would appear that the Peabody faculty believe traditional research materials or resources are still important to their research and, one would assume, use them predominantly. Two-thirds of the respondents rated published documents at the highest level of importance. Unpublished documents were not viewed as highly important, but more than a third ranked them as "3" or higher.

"Experiment and/or observation" received the second highest mean score of the possibilities listed, but the variance detected was greater than for published documents. Three-quarters of the 67 answering indicated a "4" or "5" level of importance, but 11 individuals gave this method or materials a "1" or a "2."

With the "interview or questionnaire" there also exists a fairly wide variance, but not as large as with "experiment or observation." Over 67 percent believe this "raw material" to be very important ("4") or most important ("5") to their investigation.

Twenty-three percent of those responding feel that computer data tapes are very important ("4" or "5" on the scale) as the raw material for their research, although the overall mean for this item is below the midpoint. For this and each of the other items listed in this question, further analysis based upon demographic data in Section I would be in order.

TABLE II-G

RAW MATERIALS OF RESEARCH

Materials	Mean	Rank
Published documents	4.5	1
Experiment and/or observation	4.0	2
Interview or questionnaire	3.9	3
Computer data tapes	2.4	4
Unpublished documents	2.3	5
Mathematical model	1.8	6

3 Kinds of Information Used in Research

Question 3 in this section addressed the issue of the kinds of information that Peabody faculty consider important to their work, choosing from among the historical, descriptive, statistical, methodological, conceptual, and others (to be specified). As can be seen in Table II-H, all but one of the five specified in the question achieved a mean rating of 3.5 or more, with only "historical" falling below (2.3). About a quarter of the respondents (24.6%), however, rated historical materials as "4" or "5." Almost half (48.4%) saw descriptive information as very significant ("4" or better), and statistical data ranked second only to the conceptual in mean level of importance. Two-thirds gave the latter a "4" or "5."

TABLE II-H

KINDS OF INFORMATION IMPORTANT TO RESEARCH

Kind/information	Mean	Rank
Conceptual	4.3	1
Statistical	4.0	2
Methodological	3.9	3
Descriptive	3.5	4
Historical	2.3	5

The mean score for methodological kinds of information was almost as high as that for statistical. Indeed, a greater percentage (71.2% compared to 67.6%) rated this a "4" or "5." Only 16 percent rated the conceptual category at "3" or less. With over half of the faculty members who responded marking it at the highest level of importance, the conceptual category is apparently the most important kind of information used for research.

SECTION III: GENERAL INFORMATION NEEDS

1 Physical Formats

Table III-A, compiled in response to the question concerning the perceived importance of various formats to the respondents' information needs, suggests that education scholars still rely heavily upon printed materials in the forms of periodicals, books, and research reports. On a scale of 1-5, these formats were rated close to 4.0 or better, with periodicals achieving a mean rating of 4.75. A significant number of research reports, it might be observed, are now published through the ERIC clearinghouse, but microforms received only 2.62, a moderate rating on this scale. Presumably, even scholars who utilize documents published through ERIC would prefer to read the printed (or hardcopy) form rather than the microfiche.

A more notable finding is the importance that education scholars place on personal contacts as a source of information.

The ratings of conferences and colleagues (at one's own institution and elsewhere) form a convenient continuum of responses ranging from 3.48 to 3.75 and ranking 5th, 6th, and 7th in perceived importance. Although Stieg did not include these categories in her study, they were included in the Bath study and the parallel is notable: colleagues ranked 6th and conferences 11th.

Falling into the moderate range of importance (2.49-2.88) are the "problem formats"--government publications, microforms, video-tapes, and computer printouts. One wonders what level of importance would be assigned to these formats if (1) they were easier to use and/or (2) scholars were more familiar with them. In the case of microforms, familiarity has not lessened contempt, for, as we have already noted, the ERIC collection is now a staple in the Education Library on the Peabody campus of Vanderbilt University and offers much to the education scholar. As sources of information, the other formats probably have less to offer at this time, with the possible exception of government publications.

Of those bringing up the rear (rated below 2.0), only theses and dissertations come as a surprise. Historians responding to Stieg rated them 2.75 and ranked them in the upper 50% of the formats. Perhaps the fact that most dissertations are now available only in microform contributes to this perception. The other formats--newspapers, maps, films, and sound and video media--are rarely thought of as important sources of information for most research in education and human development.

TABLE III-A

INFORMATION NEEDS BY PHYSICAL FORMATS

Format	Importance Rating (Mean)	Rank	Rank in Bath Survey*	Rank in Stieg Survey
Periodicals	4.75	1	3	2
Books & pamphlets	4.46	2	2	1
Research reports	4.11	3	8	7
Books (collections)	3.94	4	5	1
Colleagues (elsewhere)	3.75	5	6	--
Colleagues(own institution)	3.67	6	6	--
Conferences	3.48	7	11	--
Computer printouts	2.88	8	12	11
Video-tape	2.49	9	19	13
Theses and dissertations	2.68	10	9.5	6.5
Microforms	2.62	11	14	5
Government publications	2.75	12	6.5	6.5
Sound recordings	1.94	13	17	10
Films	1.75	14	18	12
Newspapers	1.73	15	9.5	4
Radio or television	1.58	16	--	--
Other pictorial	1.47	17	15	8
Maps	1.17	18	13	9

*The Bath study also included a category entitled "Other Physical Formats," which ranked fourth in its survey.

2 Convenience and Difficulty of Use

Not surprisingly, a ranking of the same formats according to convenience of use (as indicated by the frequency with which each is listed among the three easiest or most convenient format to use) displays a striking similarity to the ranking according to importance as an information source (Table III-B). Seen another way, those most often cited as the least convenient to use are, by and large, those that received a low importance rating (Table III-C). However, there is more agreement about the easier formats than the more difficult ones. Periodicals were checked by 70 of the 83 respondents, with books and pamphlets checked by 54, research reports by 22, books (collections) by 20, and colleagues at own institution (convenient, we assume in another sense) by 18.

Among the formats perceived to be more difficult, none received more than 25 votes, though the following formats were grouped at the top with 20 checks or more: theses and dissertations (25), films and government publications (24), video-tape (22), and microforms (21).

One irony in these listings is the obvious aversion to the new format on the part of education professors and scholars.

As in many colleges and universities of the eighties, those surveyed do not represent, at least in terms of age, the new breed, a new generation; rather, they represent a group of professors who were, in large part, educated prior to 1970 and safely tenured before 1980. Perhaps, then, it should not come as a surprise to find an education faculty slow to embrace the newer media. One watches and waits with interest to record the impact of the microcomputer on such attitudes, an impact that may not be discernible in such surveys as this for another five years.

TABLE III-B

FORMATS ACCORDING TO CONVENIENCE OF USE

Format	Most Convenient (Frequency)	Rank
Periodicals	70	1
Books and pamphlets	54	2
Research reports	22	3
Books (collections)	20	4
Colleagues (own institution)	18	5
Conferences	8	6
Video-tape	8	6
Colleagues (elsewhere)	7	8
Computer printouts	6	9
Microforms	4	10
Radio or television	3	11
Newspapers	2	12
Government publications	1	13
Other pictorial	1	13
Sound recordings	1	13
Other	1	13
Maps	--	--
Films	--	--
Theses and dissertations	--	--

TABLE III-C

FORMATS ACCORDING TO DIFFICULTY OF USE

Format	Most Difficult (Frequency)	Rank
Theses and dissertations	25	1
Films	24	2
Government publications	24	2
Video-tape	22	4
Microforms	21	5
Computer printouts	17	6
Colleagues (own institution)	16	7
Sound recordings	14	8
Maps	13	9
Other pictorial	11	10
Conferences	10	11
Research reports	9	12
Colleagues (elsewhere)	6	13
Newspapers	5	14
Books (collections)	3	15
Radio or television	3	15
Books and pamphlets	--	--
Periodicals	--	--
Other	--	--

3 Methods of Discovery

When asked to rate the various methods of discovering references to relevant published information, the respondents indicated that they value highly the practice of scanning professional journals--still more testimony to the importance of professional journals to education scholars. Scanning professional journals ranked first (4.24), followed by abstracts/indexes (4.16), and bibliographical references in books/periodicals (4.10). Online computer search made a respectable showing of 3.17, following the more traditional means of colleagues (3.80) and library catalogues (3.30). The librarian as a source of information came out somewhat better than in the Bath and Stieg studies (2.73), but still ranked 12th out of a possible 14. How these and other sources compared with each other and with similar items in the Bath and Stieg studies can be seen in Table III-D.

Wood and Bower, upon asking the survey participants where they found their periodical references, learned that the periodical article (25.1%) was the most frequently listed source, followed closely by the non-periodical publication (22.5%) and the abstracting and indexing publication (21.3%). In this part of their study, the verbal recommendation was cited by only 13.0 percent, other sources 12.4 percent, and private or library index by 5.7 percent. However, these researchers conclude:

> Generally speaking, social scientists rely on personal recommendation (including citations at the ends of articles and books) as a means of locating references to potentially useful papers. Abstracting and indexing services, perhaps because they are less well known and less comprehensive, are used much less in the social sciences than in the natural sciences and technology.[1]

Our own findings show, not only in this section but in others as well, the importance of personal recommendations in the research process. However, our social scientists rank abstracts and indexes among the most valuable methods of discovering relevant published information.

---

1. D. N. Wood and C. A. Bower, "The Use of Social Science Periodical Literature," Journal of Documentation 25 (June 1969): 115-16.

TABLE III-D

METHODS OF DISCOVERING RELEVANT PUBLISHED INFORMATION

Method	Importance Rating (Mean)	Rank	Rank in Bath Survey*	Rank in Stieg Survey**
Professional journals	4.24	1		
Abstracts/indexes	4.16	2	3	5/5
References in books/ periodicals	4.10	3	1	1/1
Colleagues	3.80	4	4/6***	9/8 6/4
Library catalogues	3.30	5	8	4/6
Online services	3.17	6		
Acquisition lists	3.03	7	9	
Bibliographies	2.97	8	6	2/3
Book reviews	2.94	9	11	2/3
Publishers' catalogues	2.88	10	5	
Library shelves (own institution)	2.78	11	10	7/7
Librarian	2.73	12	13	10/10
SDI	2.22	13		
Library shelves (elsewhere)	1.94	14	12	
Other****	4.00			

*The Bath survey included "Consulting known expert," which ranked 2nd.

**The Stieg survey divided the responses into "Usefulness for Research" and "Usefulness for Current Information," and the divided rankings reflects these two aspects.

***Both the Bath and the Stieg surveys divided this question into two parts: "Discussion with colleagues at own institution" and "Discussion or correspondence with acquaintances elsewhere," and the rankings listed here reflect the respective rankings.

****Not ranked because only two checked this question.

4 Keys to Non-Book Materials

For those professors who find it necessary to use some "non-book" materials, one question addressed the source of such information. Out of a possible 83, 24 (28.9%) indicated that they used abstracts and indexes; 19 (22.9%) indicated that they used both specialized bibliographies and librarians; and 23 (27.7%) checked that they use other sources, with faculty colleagues being the most frequently mentioned. Other sources of non-print materials included advertisements, professional journals, professional associations, and the government.

5 Citation Indexes as Sources of Information

The investigators posed a number of informational/conditional questions, describing means of discovering and using information of which some of the respondents might not likely be aware. One of these questions described the workings of a citation index (e.g., Social

Science Citation Index) and asked just how useful such a tool would be.

All but three persons responded to this question and rated it 3.83 on the 5.0 scale, suggesting a moderately high level of enthusiasm for the idea of a citation index as a non-conventional approach to indexing and abstracting. However, this response remains clouded by the probability that the knowledge of the respondents of an actual index is very limited. They responded favorably to the idea of a citation index which may or may not prove as useful to them in actual practice.

In their follow-up study at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, McBride and Stenstrom found that 69 percent of the psychology faculty and 67 percent of the educational psychology faculty "usually" found their references to other serial articles in the bibliographies and footnotes of journals. At the same time, 72 percent of the psychology faculty and 60 percent of the educational psychology faculty thought it would be "very helpful" for the library to provide a "Current Contents" service.[2]

---

2. Ruth B. McBride and Patricia Stenstrom, "Psychology Journal Usage," Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian 2 (Fall 1980/81): 2-3.

6 Timeliness of Publication

With the advent of online computer searching, which provides an important but often delayed access to research materials, the investigators wished to find out the value that the respondents put on timeliness of publication, asking, "How important is it to you to know what is being published *very soon* after publication?" (italics added here) All 83 respondents answered this question and over 50 percent of them gave it a 5, for a mean value of 4.30.

Not being sure what this strong response might mean in actual practice, the investigators followed with a question to determine "how much delay is generally tolerable . . . between the publication of an article or paper in print and its appearance in a published indexing or abstracting journal." The results can be seen in Table III-E, with over 70 percent responding that they expect to have access to a publication through an indexing or abstracting journal in less than 6 months.

TABLE III-E

PERMISSIBLE DELAYS IN ABSTRACTING/INDEXING JOURNALS

Time Period	Absolute freq.	Relative freq. (%)	Rank
Up to 1 month	5	6.0	4
1-3 months	31	37.3	1
3-6 months	31	37.3	1
6-12 months	13	15.7	3
Over 12 months	---	---	

7 Facilitation of Research

A second informational/conditional question asked, "How much would your ability to gather information be facilitated by the following circumstances. . . ?" Here the investigators posed a series of services that could, in the main, emanate from the library. The results as they appear in Table III-F reveal a relatively high level of acceptance--an almost uncritical acceptance, one would be tempted to say--of these services of the future, perhaps the least original of which (receiving photocopies of articles from journals) received the highest rating (4.23) with a departmental online catalog not far behind (3.94). But virtually all of the services proposed were well received and suggest an openness on the part of the faculty to new ideas from the library that would facilitate their research. Such a question may find its greatest value through the information it provides for faculty and the seed it plants in their minds for possibilities for more effective information services on the part of the library.

TABLE III-F

FACILITATION OF RESEARCH THROUGH SPECIAL INFORMATION SERVICES

Possible Service	Importance Rating (Mean)	Rank
Photocopies of journal articles	4.23	1
Departmental access to an online catalog of local library holdings	3.94	2
Office delivery of library materials	3.73	3
Departmental access to other research libraries	3.71	4
Current journal checkout	3.69	5
Bound journal checkout	3.61	6
Table of contents of current journals	3.59	7
Subject specialist librarian	3.52	8
Departmental copy of COM edition of periodical holdings	3.47	9
Fee-based online service for major indexing and abstracting services	3.47	9
Updates of computer SDI's	3.38	11
New formats available in library	3.18	12

SECTION IV: PERSONAL INFORMATION RESOURCES

1 Personal Collections of Books

When asked to indicate the number of volumes they possess that are directly related to their research and teaching, 51.8 percent of the respondents indicated that they owned 300 volumes or less (Table IV-A). According to *Scholarly Communication*, on the other hand, the personal libraries of scholars in general average about 600 volumes and range up to 2,000 volumes.[1]

Our findings based on the Peabody faculty suggest a lower number than that in *Scholarly Communication*, even though our question was not phrased in such a way as to derive a true arithmetic mean. The median size of the personal book collection is in the 200-300-volume range, with over half those responding

---

1. *Scholarly Communication: The Report of the National Enquiry* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), p. 91.

falling below 300. At the other extreme, a surprising 10.8 percent reported a collection of 1,000 volumes or more.

Exact comparisons of personal book collections for professional use are not easy to find, but it is our impression that these figures tend to run lower than those reported in other studies and simply observed among collegues in other areas--especially in areas such a languages and literture where both paperbacks and complimentary classroom copies of texts are more readily available than in the social sciences. Perhaps the fact that our questionnaire asked for the number of volumes directly related to research and teaching could have had a limiting effect on the number of titles reported.

TABLE IV-A

PERSONAL INFORMATION RESOURCES: BOOKS

No. of Titles	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)	Cum. Freq. (%)
Fewer than 100	15	18.1	18.1	18.1
101-200	16	19.3	19.3	37.3
201-300	12	14.5	14.5	51.8
301-400	9	10.8	10.8	62.7
401-500	5	6.0	6.0	68.7
501-600	7	8.4	8.4	77.1
601-700	2	2.4	2.4	79.5
701-800	3	3.6	3.6	83.1
801-900	2	2.4	2.4	85.5
901-1000	1	1.2	1.2	86.7
More than 1000	9	10.8	10.8	97.6
No response	2	2.4	2.4	100.0
TOTAL	83	100.0	100.0	

2 Personal Subscriptions to Professional Journals

According to the responses to this questionnaire, few education scholars subscribe to more than 10 professional journals (Table IV-B). In fact, 54.9 percent reported that they subscribe to five or fewer titles, and 90.2 percent subscribe to 10 or fewer titles. Five reported that they receive 11-15 titles, one 16-20, one 21-25, and one over 25 titles.

Given the heavy emphasis put on periodical literature in other sections of this study (especially Section III, General Information Needs), it appears obvious these that education scholars do not meet a high portion of their information needs through personal subscriptions to professional journals. For a number of years, some Peabody departments maintained their own subscriptions, but in 1982 the administration began to require all such subscriptions to be limited to the library.

Just what this implies for library services is not clear, though one might logically assume that the few personal subscriptions would mean a high dependence on the library. A study at the University of Illinois, however, found that the faculty used the library as a supplementary, not a primary, source for serial publications--even in one of the richest libraries in the nation.[2]

Our findings would seem to indicate that the Peabody faculty does indeed depend upon periodical holdings of the library or, perhaps, upon obtaining this type of publication in some manner other than through personal subscription, such as preprints or reprints of articles.

---

[2] Patricia Stenstrom and Ruth B. McBride, "Serial Use by Social Science Faculty: A Survey," College and Research Libraries 40 (September 1979): 426-31.

TABLE IV-B

PERSONAL INFORMATION RESOURCES: JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

No. of Titles	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)	Cum. Freq. (%)
1-5	45	54.2	54.9	54.9
6-10	29	34.9	35.4	90.2
11-15	5	6.0	6.1	96.3
16-20	1	1.2	1.2	97.6
21-25	1	1.2	1.2	98.8
More than 25	1	1.2	1.2	100.0
Missing data	1	1.2	1.2	100.
TOTAL	83	100.0	100.0	

3 Personal File Maintenance

Table IV-C reports responses to the question concerning how scholars in education maintain their personal files of references. The results suggest that index cards and photocopies of documents are the primary means of maintaining such files, with 65.1 percent and 50.6 percent of those responding checking these forms. One third indicated that they use typed or printed lists, while one-fourth said that they use computers--18 percent for microcomputers and 8 percent for mainframes. Given the pace of computers in education, we can, in all likelihood, expect to see greater use of microcomputers in the future for all aspects of personal information management.

Four faculty members volunteered other forms of file maintenance, one of which was intended to be covered in the question: "computerized literature search printouts." Other more conventional (and perhaps more candid) persons listed such forms and practices as "piles on tables," "looseleaf notebook," and "pieces of scrap paper in my shirt pocket and billfold."

TABLE IV-C

PERSONAL REFERENCE FILES

Form	Absolute Freq.	Relative* Freq. (%)	Rank
Index cards	54	65.1	1
Typed or printed lists	28	33.7	3
Photocopies of documents	42	50.6	2
Microcomputer database	18	21.7	4
Mainframe computer database	8	9.6	5
Other	5	6.0	6

*Totals more than 100% because respondents could check more than one category.

SECTION V: LIBRARY USE

1 The Vanderbilt Library System

Section V of the questionnaire was the only one dedicated exclusively to library use, attempting to determine the extent of use by the Peabody faculty of the various units, adequacy of collections, means of discovering information in the library system, and the age of materials most often used.

The Vanderbilt University Library--recently named the Jean and Alexander Heard Library of Vanderbilt University--is both old and young. The history of a library for Vanderbilt University dates back to the early days of the University, but in 1936 George Peabody College for Teachers, Scarritt College for Christian Workers, and Vanderbilt University, pioneered a cooperative library enterprise by establishing the Joint University Libraries (JUL), one of the unique experiments in

American academic library history. Under the JUL charter, the three schools contributed to a service institution which had its own officers and board of trustees. Its employees, including the librarians, were not normally members of any faculty, an arrangement which had both advantages and disadvantages. In retrospect, one can say with some assurance that, for whatever the reason, the JUL received only marginal funding during much of its existence despite all the efforts of its directors. Both its services and collections suffered accordingly. Through the Vanderbilt Library Excellence Fund, made possible in large part through the efforts of former Vanderbilt chancellor Alexander Heard, the JUL was able to supplement its regular budgets for major collection development activities.

With the Peabody-Vanderbilt merger in 1979, Vanderbilt University took on the responsibility--for the first time in over 40 years--of administering a university library. Known first as the Vanderbilt University Library (VUL), the system took the name of the Heards in May 1984.

At present the Heard Library consists of eleven collections totaling over 1,500,000 volumes. The Central Library, including the H. Fort Flowers graduate wing, contains over 680,000 volumes and emphasizes humanities, social sciences, and general reference materials. The Central Library shares a building with the Divinity Library, Library System Administration, General Technical Services, and the Vanderbilt Television News Archive, which maintains a videotape collection of the evening newscasts of the three major television networks.

The Education Library on the Peabody campus holds more than 220,000 volumes in the fields of education, psychology, special education, child study, library and information science, literature for children and adolescents, and curriculum materials. It subscribes to the ERIC service, which now contains some 206,000 microfiche. It was one of the first libraries in the system to offer online computer services, relying primarily on the ERIC data base through DIALOG. Another noteworthy collection is the Peabody Collection of Books on Children, consisting of over 13,000 volumes on all subjects related to children.

The Curriculum Laboratory is also part of the Education Library. Designed for teacher education students and faculty, the laboratory is a materials center offering instructional aids such as kits for individualized instruction, instructional games, curriculum guides and textbooks, and other curriculum materials.

Before the study was undertaken, it was assumed that the Education Library and the Central Library would be those most utilized by the Peabody faculty--an assumption that has been born out by the responses of the faculty. However, some use is made of other divisions of the Jean and Alexander Heard Library, which include the following: the Divinity Library, the Alyne Queener Massey Law Library and Legal Information Center, the Walker Management Library, the Medical Center Library, the Music Library, the A. J. Dyer Observatory Library, and the Sara Shannon

Stevenson Science Library.

Table V-A provides a full list of the libraries in the Heard system, with their approximate holdings as of June 30, 1984.

TABLE V-A

THE VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES: THE JEAN AND ALEXANDER HEARD LIBRARY SYSTEM

Name of Library	Holdings
Central Library	681,424
Divinity Library	134,534
Education Library	222,320
Law Library	136,000
Management Library	16,700
Medical Library	137,203
Music Library	23,089
Observatory Library	7,167
Science Library	201,654
Special Collections	10,512
Total volumes	1,507,603
Television News Archive	10,000 hours videotape

2 Use of the Vanderbilt Library

In response to the question asking for the number of visits to the Vanderbilt University Libraries during a typical month, the response showed a mean of 6, but with a range than runs from 0 to 25. The norm appears to be 4 or 5 visits per month, or about one per week.

As expected, the Education Library and the Central Library are the two units of the Heard Library system that receive the most use from Peabody faculty; they were, in fact, the only two in the system receiving a mean rating of over 3.0 on a 5.0-point scale. With the exception of these two, there were a relatively high number of non-respondents (8-15) for each library listed, even though the lowest rating (1) indicated that a library was "not used" by the faculty member in question. Thus the mean rating of some of the lesser used libraries is even a little lower that it would have been had we transposed all of the non-responses to the value of 1.

It should be noted here that the wording of the question may have been a problem. The phrase "have you used" could have been altered or qualified in some fashion to "do you use" or "have you used during the past month or over a typical month."

Table V-B summarizes the responses to this question of use of the various Vanderbilt libraries. The findings provide a few small surprises, although most of the responses would have been predictable.

TABLE V-B

USE OF THE VANDERBILT LIBRARY SYSTEM

Name of Library	Mean	Rank
Education Library	4.56	1
Central Library	3.48	2
Medical Library	2.55	3
Science Library	2.19	4
Management Library	1.94	5
Law Library	1.47	6
Special Collections	1.28	7
Music Library	1.19	8
Divinity Library	1.15	9
Television News Archive	1.09	10
Observatory Library	1.03	11

Peabody faculty show a clear preference for the Education Library. It was given the highest mean ranking (4.6). Over 90 percent of the respondents ranked it at "4" or "5," with three-quarters at the highest level. The mean rating for the Central Library is not nearly as high as Education, but it is beyond the midpoint, with over half of those who responded ranking their use at a "4" or "5" level.

Use of the Medical Library reflects a substantial amount of health-related research on the Peabody campus. More than 25 percent of the respondents rated the Medical Library a "4" or "5," and almost 40 percent gave it a "3" or better.

The Science Library had a mean of just over 2.0, but about a third of the faculty gave it a "3" or better. The Management Library followed with slightly under a 2.0. Over two-thirds of the Peabody faculty either have never used it or ranked it at the "1" or "2" level.

Other libraries in the system appear to receive minimal use from the Peabody faculty. Almost 90 percent listed no use of the Divinity Library, and over 75 percent no use of the Law Library. The Music Library (which has not had an academic home since the Peabody School of Music was phased out at the time of the merger) receives very low use, even though it is located on the Peabody campus. Neither the Observatory Library nor Special Collections has received significant use by the Peabody faculty, with use of the Television News Archive being greater than the use of the Observatory Library.

3 Adequacy of the Vanderbilt Library System

The present study asked respondents to rate the Vanderbilt library system according to its adequacy for research and for teaching. It is seen by the Peabody faculty as only slightly better for teaching (mean of 3.7) than for research (3.4). Almost 90 percent of the respondents think the libraries to be moderately (3.0) to fully (5.0) adequate for teaching, with over half giving this category a "4" or better. Almost 90 percent also indicated moderate to full adequacy for research purposes, with a little over 10 percent giving it a "1" or "2" on the 5-point scale.

4 Borrowing from Other Libraries

In question 3 of this section, respondents were asked to indicate what percentage of the library books and periodicals used by them have been borrowed from other libraries.

However adequate or inadequate the Vanderbilt library collections, few faculty members say that they borrow much from other libraries. About 83 percent borrow 10 or less percent of their books and periodicals elsewhere, and almost a third do not borrow at all from other sources. Over 90 percent of the faculty get more than 75 percent of the books and periodicals they borrow directly from the Vanderbilt system.

5 Sources of Materials

Question 5 sought to determine the source of materials for research, offering a choice from among one's own resources, materials obtained from the Vanderbilt library, and materials obtained from other libraries. Peabody faculty clearly rely heavily (or feel that they do) upon their own resources, giving themselves a mean ranking of 4.4, followed by the Vanderbilt library with 4.0, and other libraries with 2.1. No one indicated a "1" for his own materials, while over half marked "5" and 90 percent marked "4" or "5." Almost 30 percent saw the local library materials as of the highest importance (5), with over 70 percent giving such materials a "4" or a "5." A small number (9%) reported finding materials from other libraries of highest importance, suggesting the need for further study for this minority.

6 Problems in the Use of the Vanderbilt Libraries

Question 6 sought to identify problems in information seeking encountered in the Vanderbilt libraries. In the data reported in Table V-C, the low part of the scale indicates problems and the high part satisfaction. Ranging from "frequently a problem" (1) to "never a problem" (5), the difficulties generally have to do with items not being owned (2.8), missing (3.0), or non-circulating (3.0), and the length of time it takes to obtain something on interlibrary loan (3.2). Since the lowest of the means fall within the moderate range, the problems do not seem to be seen as terribly serious, though they are not to be dismissed. The factors of interlibrary loan time period (3.5) and the service or knowledge of the library staff (3.8) are rated fairly high, and the latter speaks well of the faculty confidence in the library staff. However--there is always a cloud--about 18 percent of those responding to this question perceive a problem with staff service or knowledge. Further investigation into these perceived problem could be a useful outcome of this study.

The second part of the question asked to what extent these problem had been resolved. The mean response (3.4) indicates only a moderate ability to solve the problems encountered, half of the faculty indicated that they were able to resolve their difficulties from almost fully to fully (4 and 5).

TABLE V-C

PROBLEMS IN THE USE OF THE VANDERBILT LIBRARIES

(Ranked from Most Serious to Least Serious Problem)

Problem	Mean	Rank
Materials not owned by the Vanderbilt University Libraries	2.83	1
Materials not at their designated locations	2.96	2
Non-circulating materials	3.01	3
Length of interlibrary loan periods	3.53	4
Length of time to acquire items on interlibrary loan	3.18	5
Service or knowledge of the library staff	3.75	6

7 Value of Library Tools

Library finding tools was the subject of question 7 and is summarized in Table V-D. Their value to the Peabody faculty ranked according to means from 4.1 for printed indexes and abstracts to 2.7 for the online computerized catalog. It seems that the Peabody faculty still finds hard copy, be it card or page, of more value than similar material in electronic form.

It is interesting to note that fully one-quarter of the respondents (20) rate the card catalog a "5," whereas less than a third of that number give the online catalog the same rating. One would expect that once a true online catalog is installed at Vanderbilt (as opposed to the OCLC public service terminal the faculty probably interpret as such) this attitude would change, and a follow-up survey when such a catalog becomes reality would be advisable.

It seems clear from this question that Peabody faculty still put the highest priority on printed indexes and abstracts; 94 percent rated them "3"or better and no one gave them the lowest rating. But it is moderately encouraging to see that more than half of the faculty view online indexes and abstracts as either a "4" or a "5."

TABLE V-D

VALUE OF LIBRARY RESEARCH TOOLS

Tool	Mean	Rank
Printed indexes and abstracts	4.11	1
Library card catalogs	3.79	2
Printed bibliographies	3.68	3
Online computerized indexing and abstracting services	3.41	4
Online computerized catalogue (e.g., OCLC)	2.73	5

8 Accidental Discovery

Serendipity is an acknowledged factor in the research process. A recent article in College and Research Libraries points our that a number of user studies have indicated that "footnotes, personal recommendations from other scholars, serendipitous discovery, browsing, personal bibliographic files, and other such techniques that involve no formal use of access tools account for the great majority of citations obtained by scholars."[1]

Question 8.a. of this section, after stating that accidental discovery is a common experience in research, asked, "How often have you picked up material by accident or by purposeful browsing?" As can be seen in Table V-E, nearly 87 percent of those responding said that they scanned current periodicals quite often (as indicated by a "4" or a "5"), with respondents assigning this activity a mean value of 4.19. Only one person said that scanning journalss never resulted in accidental discovery of something useful. Interestingly, the mode for journal scanning was "4," while it was "5" for accidental discovery by looking up a known reference. The mean for the latter was lower in part because three persons answered that they never found anything else while looking up a known item.

Two other activities were not far behind: "Looking up a given reference and spotting something else at the same time" (4.11) and "In conversation with colleagues" (3.93). About one-third of the respondents believe that conversations with colleagues have often ("5") led to discoveries, and better than two-thirds ranked this activity a "4" or a "5."

---

1. Steven K. Stoan, "Research and Library Skills: An Analysis and Interpretation," College and Research Libraries 45 (March 1984): 101.

Library browsing (3.38) by the Peabody faculty is apparently not as frequent a means of finding items as these other methods. About 20 percent of the respondents found library browsing of the highest importance, but more than a quarter rated it at "2" or below. Book stores are apparently seen as being low to moderate sources of accidental discovery, with about 75 percent of the respondents giving this item a rating of "3" or below (with a mean of 2.68). Mass media follow with a 2.31 mean and 90 percent rating it at "3" or less.

When asked directly in question 8.b. just how important finding materials this way is, the faculty responded with a mean rating of 3.91, with 65 percent giving it a "3" or better (about evenly distributed over the top three classifications).

In the "other" category, four persons responded that they found materials through professional newsletters and weekly reports, colleagues' offices, correspondence with colleagues, and discussion with students.

TABLE V-E

MEANS OF ACCIDENTAL DISCOVERY

Means of discovery	Mean	Rank
By scanning current periodicals	4.19	1
By looking up a given reference and spotting something else at the same time	4.11	2
In conversation with colleagues	3.93	3
By browsing through library stacks	3.38	4
Through offprints and pamphlets	2.70	5
In book stores	2.68	6
Through mass media	2.31	7

9 Dates of Publication of Books and Periodicals

The last two questions in this section inquired into the timeliness of books and periodicals in the research of Peabody faculty. The results were entirely predictable for a social science faculty group and require little analysis (Table V-F and Table V-G). They simply say that the newer the book or periodical literature, the more likely faculty are to require access to it. Ranking of the means for the various time categories set for books and periodicals shows an inverse order from the chronological order in which they were listed.

Material prior to 1900 is little used; seven persons did not bother to respond to how often they needed books published prior to 1900 and about 60 percent checked "1" (never). On the other hand, the evaluation of the importance of the most recent material in book and periodical form approach unanimity of agreement--a mean of 4.91 both for books and periodicals.

TABLE V-F

AGE OF BOOKS REQUIRED FOR RESEARCH

Years	Mean	Rank
Before 1900	1.61	6
1901-1950	2.29	5
1951-1960	2.72	4
1961-1970	3.59	3
1971-1980	4.57	2
1981-	4.91	1

TABLE V-G

AGE OF JOURNALS REQUIRED FOR RESEARCH

Years	Mean	Rank
Before 1965	2.73	5
1965-1970	3.18	4
1971-1975	3.95	3
1976-1980	4.56	2
1981-	4.91	1

SECTION VI: LANGUAGES USED IN RESEARCH

1 Languages Read

The results of Section VI, "Languages Used in Research," suggest that foreign language material is of very little importance as an information source to the Peabody faculty. This finding is not particularly surprising in light of other studies that have shown that American and British social scientists in general make little use of non-English works--and that, among social scientists, those in education and social psychology are possibly the most "linguistically isolated."[1]

Along the same lines, the INFROSS study, which surveyed a broad spectrum of researchers in the social sciences, concluded:

---

[1] Lorenz J. Finison and Charles L. Whittenmore, "Linguistic Isolation of American Social Psychology,"American Psychology 30 (April 1975): 513-16. Also, Robert N. Broadus, "The Literature of the Social Sciences: A Survey of Citation Studies," International Social Science Journal 23 (1971):236-43.

> Researchers in education, psychology, economics, and statistics were less likely to read foreign languages than researchers in geography, political science, and anthropology.[2]

Wood and Bower, in their study of social science periodical literature, found that 98.4 percent of the requests for periodical literature were in English, contrasting this figure with 75.9 percent in a survey of the use of science and technology periodicals carried out at the National Lending Library of Great Britain in 1963.[3]

The first question in this section was designed to determine what languages (other than English) faculty read that are important to their research and teaching. A mere 6 percent of the 83 respondents indicated that they read French, 3.6 percent German, 2.4 percent Spanish, and 1.2 percent other languages. Approximately 87 percent, then, did not identify any

---

2. Information Requirements of Researchers in the Social Sciences, ed. Maurice B. Line et al. Investigation into Information Requirements of the Social Sciences, Research Report no. 1, vol. 1 (Bath: Bath University Library, 1971), p. 197.

3. D. N. Wood and C. A. Bower, "The Use of Social Science Periodical Literature," Journal of Documentation 25 (June 1969): 111.

4. The figure of 87 percent is approximate because some respondents checked two languages and thus were counted twice in the percentage of those who read languages other than English.

foreign language used.[4]

It is not clear, however, whether or not all respondents recognized that this first question asked only for those languages that are actually important to them in their research and teaching. That is, some respondents may have understood the question in more general terms, asking for languages that they were able to read, whether or not those languages are used in research. Some of the handwritten comments support this inference as does the response to the second question.[5]

In response to question 2, "Do you regularly scan literature in these languages?" only one person (1.2%) responded that he/she did. In brief, 97.8 percent of the Peabody faculty surveyed do not make regular use of foreign language material.

Although the INFROSS study concluded that the researchers they surveyed were reluctant to scan foreign-language publications, one important difference remains between those surveyed in England and those questioned in this study: the reluctance is more extreme in our study for the apparent reason that the British read more foreign languages than the American counterparts. A full 48 percent of those surveyed in the INFROSS study could read French and 17 percent German; only 11 percent of those responding indicated that they read no language other than English. "Linguistic isolation" is, then, a relative term.[6]

---

[5] One person checked two languages but wrote that he/she did not use them for research.

2 Languages Used

The next two questions went on to explore the occasional use of foreign-language material. When asked what they would do if they were to "come across a reference to, or abstract of, an item which appears relevant to your work, and it is written in a foreign language that you can read," 34.9 percent responded that they would be considerably more reluctant to look up the item than if it were in English; 3.6 percent said they would be slightly more reluctant; and 6 percent indicated they would be no more reluctant.

It is important to add here that 55.4 percent of all respondents did not answer this question, suggesting that they did not consider foreign language materials applicable even occasionally to the kinds of research they were doing or that they cannot read a foreign language.

---

[6] Information Requirements, p. 221.

3 References to Other Languages

The next question explored responses to references to apparently relevant items written in languages the faculty member could not read. If the original were easily accessible, 1.2 percent indicated that they would usually get the item translated, 10.8 percent would usually try to get the gist of it themselves, and 18 percent would usually search for a summary or abstract. If, however, the item were easily accessible and believed to be very important, 28.9 percent indicated that they would try to get it translated, 9.6 percent would try to get the gist of it themselves, and 12 percent would search for a summary or abstract. Considering the item relevant (but not necessarily very important), 37.3 percent indicated they would ignore such an item written in a foreign language they could not read, even if it were easily accessible.

If the items were not readily accessible, respondents would, as might be expected, be even less willing to take measures to discover their contents, as show in Table VI-A. Faced with this question, only one respondent (1.2%) indicated that he/she would usually try to get such an item translated, and 12.2 percent agreed that they would do so only if the item were considered very important. This latter figure differs by 16 percent from the 28.9 percent who indicated a willingness to take the same action if access were easy. Only one person indicated interest in trying to get the gist of less accessible item, while 10.8 percent said that they would go that far only if the item were very important. Slightly over 10 percent (12.2%) indicated that they would solve the problem by looking for an abstract or summary, and the same percentage of respondents said they would take these steps only if the item were thought to be important. Significantly, nearly 50 percent (49.4%) indicated that they would ignore the item entirely if the original were not easily accessible, while 37.3 percent gave the same response concerning items which would be easily accessible.

Whether or not the original were easily available, no more than half of those responding replied to any part of this question--even those who responded by saying that they would ignore the citation containing the reference in another language. This may be the most telling figure of all in trying to measure the importance that this faculty sets upon use of foreign languages.

TABLE VI-A

REFERENCE TO MATERIALS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Action Taken	Original Easily Accessible (%)			Original Not Easily Accessible (%)		
	Usually	Only if Important	No Resp.	Usually	Only if Important	No Resp.
Try to get it translated	1.2	28.9	69.9	1.2	12.2	87.6
Try to get the gist of it	10.8	9.6	79.5	1.2	10.8	87.9
Search for summ. or abstract	21.7	12.0	66.3	12.0	12.0	75.9
Ignore it	37.3	---	62.6	49.4	---	50.6

4 Effect of Languages on Choice of Research Topic

Question 5 in this section asked whether one's choice of a research subject were affected by "the amount of English-language material on the subject." That is, would one "be less likely to choose a subject in which there is a high proportion of foreign-language material?" Nearly half (48.2%) answered affirmatively, 32.5 percent responded negatively, and 20 percent did not check a response.

The final question complemented the previous one by asking, "Do you consider that your work has been restricted or constrained in any way because of the language problem?" Although nearly 50 percent had indicated above that they would be less likely to choose a subject with a high proportion of foreign-language materials, 89 percent circled a "1" or a "2" on the 5-point scale, with "1" representing no restriction or constraints and "5" represented substantial ones. Clearly, this large majority, in choosing the lower numbers, showed that they perceive virtually no problem in their research because of language barriers. Interestingly, most participants (88%) answered this question, giving it the highest response rate for this section and indicating, resoundingly, that while, on the one hand, the Peabody faculty do not use foreign-language materials extensively, on the other hand they do not find their inability or unwillingness to use such materials a loss to their research capabilities.

SECTION VII: INFORMAL SOURCES

1 Methods of Exchanging Information

The Peabody faculty who responded to the survey indicated that informal sources were important to their information needs. When asked the extent to which they kept in touch with colleagues in other institutions, 89 percent indicated medium to frequent contact (i.e., they checked from 3 to 5 on the 5-point scale), and not one respondent indicated that he never kept in touch with colleagues. The mean response to this question was 3.927, representing 39 percent of those responding. Over one third of the respondents, therefore, maintain frequent contact with colleagues at other institutions.

The importance of personal contacts with colleagues both within and beyond the walls of one's own educational institution is a theme that surfaces in almost every section of this study.

As mentioned in a previous section, Wood and Bower found that "social scientists rely on personal recommendation . . . as a means of locating references to potentially useful papers."[1]

The second part of question 1 in this section asked, "If you do keep in touch, please rate the value to you of the following methods of exchanging information." The results can be seen in Table VII-A. Of the methods of exchanging information, the highest value was placed on "social contacts," such as telephone calls, personal visits, etc. "Social contacts" received a mean of 4.08. The next highest value was placed on "written correspondence," with a mean of 3.79. "Exchange of offprints" and "Circulation of unpublished manuscripts" were considered of almost equal value, both with respective means of 3.28 and 3.28. Electronic media (such as electronic bulletin boards, electronic mail, etc.) received the lowest mean rating of 1.879, with fully half of the faculty considering this form of no value. A number of respondents, however, qualified their ratings by written comments stating that they were either unfamiliar with this form (i.e., they did not know what it was) or had never used it and thus could not judge its value.

---

1. D. N. Wood and C. A. Bower, "The Use of Social Science Periodical Literature," Journal of Documentation 25 (June 1969): 116.

TABLE VII-A

METHODS OF EXCHANGING INFORMATION

Method	Mean	Rank
Social contacts	4.08	1
Written correspondence	3.79	2
Exchange of offprints	3.28	3
Circulation of unpublished MSS	3.27	4
Correspondence through electronic newsletters, etc.	1.88	5

2 Conference Attendance

Respondents were asked to specify the number of conferences or professional meetings they attended, according to level, i.e., local, state, regional, national, and international. Table VII-B shows the rate of attendance of the Peabody faculty responding over the 12-month period prior to the survey.

As would be expected, many faculty members indicated that they had attended conferences at several levels. As can be seen from the table, most persons attend one or two conferences per year. A high percentage (80%) of the total number attended at least one national conference. In fact, national conference attendance is higher than any other, with six persons indicating that they attended more than five national conferences in one year. Attendance at local, state, and regional meetings cluster together in terms of percentages, i.e., approximately half said they attended one or more meeting at each of these levels. The lowest percentage, not surprisingly, was in international conference attendance, where only 18.1 percent attended one or more meetings.

TABLE VII-B

CONFERENCES ATTENDED--LAST 12 MONTHS

Number	Percentage of Faculty Attending				
	Local	State	Regional	National	International
0	48.1	48.7	47.0	16.9	81.9
1	21.7	30.1	33.7	33.7	14.5
2	15.7	13.3	10.8	19.3	3.6
3	3.6	1.2	2.4	10.8	---
4	7.2	1.2	---	9.6	---
5	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	---
6+	2.4	2.4	2.4	6.8	---

3 Value of Conferences

A high value was placed on conferences as an information source, with a mean of 3.861. Conferences were not, in general, as highly rated as personal contacts with colleagues. Furthermore, within the conference setting the more personalized exchange seemed to be most highly rated, as can be seen in Table VII-C. When asked to indicate the value of the information gained from various sources at conferences, "informal contacts" received the highest value with a mean of 4.51. Of those surveyed, 88.5 percent marked either 4 or 5 in this category. "Discussions" received the next highest score, with a mean of 4.2. "Papers presented" received a mean of 3.75 and "Exhibits" were rated lowest with a mean of 2.56.

4 Stimuli and Sources of New Ideas for Research

In question 4 of this section, respondents were asked to consider in general terms several sources of information that have been dealt with in more detail in other sections of the questionnaire. They were asked to rate each source in the group on a 5-point scale ranging from "no value" to "most value." The results are arranged in order of rank in Table VII-D.

Research itself appears to have the greatest value to the researcher as a source of new ideas, with a mean of 4.32. A close second to research was reading, which received a mean rating of 4.28; of those responding 84.2 percent gave reading a rating of "4" or "5."

As might have been expected from previous comments, discussions with colleagues was also highly ranked, with a mean of 4.10 and 80 percent of the respondents giving this activity a rating of "4" or "5." Conferences and teaching are the lowest rated of this group, but both were higher than 3.5, indicating a relatively high level of importance as a source or stimulus of new ideas for research. In fact, all of the categories listed are considered relatively important sources of new ideas.

Respondents were also asked to specify any other source for new ideas, but only two were offered: visiting schools and discussions with students.

TABLE VII-C

VALUE OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE

Activity	Mean	Rank
Informal contacts	4.28	1
Discussions	4.20	2
Papers presented	3.75	3
Exhibits	2.56	4

TABLE VII-D

STIMULI AND SOURCES FOR RESEARCH

Source	Mean	Rank
Research itself	4.32	1
Reading	4.28	2
Discussions with colleagues	4.09	3
Conferences	3.69	4
Teaching	3.61	5

5 Delegation of Research

Finally, respondents were asked whether or not they delegated searching for references or materials to others, and if they did they were asked to whom they delegated these responsibilities and to what extent. Three-quarters (75.9%) of all respondents indicated that they delegated searching to others, 68.7 percent of them to graduate assistants, 19.3 percent to students in classes, and 8.4 percent to others such as library assistants, secretaries, independently employed research assistants, and colleagues. One quarter (24.2%) of the respondents indicated that they delegate research to others extensively and slightly over half (51.8%) said they used such assistance only partially.

The findings on this point in the INFROSS study are interesting to compare with our own. INFROSS found that "of those who stated that they would be willing to delegate partially, 73 percent did not actually delegate at all at the time of the questionnaire; of those who were willing to delegate extensively, 61 percent did not do so."[2]

Although the method of questioning in the INFROSS study differed from the present one, the findings in both studies appear to reflect a considerable degree of reluctance to delegate research to what INFROSS calls "information officers," who could well be thought of in terms of the "subject specialist librarian" mentioned in Section III of this study and to which the Peabody faculty responded favorably as a possible facilitator of research. The INFROSS study goes on to say:

> This may not be the most significant finding of INFROSS, but it is certainly one of the most interesting in its implications. If extensive delegation to information officers were the general practice, the whole design of information systems would be fundamentally affected. At

---

2. Information Requirements of Researchers in the Social Sciences, ed. Maurice B. Line et al. Investigation into Information Requirements of the Social Sciences, Research Report no. 1, vol. 1 (Bath: Bath University Library, 1971), p. 219.

> present, information systems are designed, if not for easy use by researchers, at least with their usage in mind. This prevents their development beyond a certain level of complexity and sophistication, though even so some bibliographical tools are by no means easy to use. If, however, one could assume an intermediary always between the information and the user, information systems could be developed to almost any level of complexity; the enormous constraint of ready usability would cease to exist, and this should make it possible for far more efficient and effective retrieval systems to be developed.[3]

Such a state of affairs can be said to exist in many special libraries and documentation centers where information systems are not "user friendly" nor need they be. With the coming of online systems since the INFROSS study, we have seen the development of an "information officer" in the person of the librarian trained in the use of online databases. It is reasonable to suppose that more sophisticated computer-based systems are on the way that will require equally sophisticated trained personnel. The full use of such personnel could, with the appropriate degree of delegation of research, lead to "more efficient and effective retrieval systems."

---

3. Ibid., pp. 219-220.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1 General Observations

At the end of the massive INFROSS study, the investigators conclude:

> It is not possible to offer a succinct statement of the findings of INFROSS, because the nature of the enquiry and the results do not lend themselves to this type of summary. . . . The communication pattern in social science research is complex, and this leads to a multiplicity of requirements, sometimes almost imperceptibly merging into one another, and sometimes conflicting with one another. This finding is not confined to INFROSS.[1]

---

1. Information Requirements of Researchers in the Social Sciences, ed. Maurice B. Line et al. Investigation into Information Requirements of the Social Sciences, Research Report no. 1, vol. 1 (Bath: Bath University Library, 1971), p. 197.

The Bath investigators were correct. Even though our own modest study does not have the dimensions of the INFROSS undertaking, we have felt the same reluctance to boil down our findings into a few tidy statements. We come to this point in our study with a greater appreciation for the complexity of information transfer in and among a relatively small group of researchers and teachers. They too have their multiplicity of requirements that both merge into each other and conflict with each other.

These disclaimers notwithstanding, the INFROSS study concludes with a cautious overview of its main findings and we assay to do the same. In our proposal to the Council on Library Resources seeking funding for this project, we cited a statement from the papers distributed by the CLR-supported Wingspread conference that "the relationship between the format of information and its utility, major subject categories, sets of users and kinds of use" be studied. In undertaking our investigation we sought to begin to understand the information-gathering practices of a particular set of users--faculty members in a college of education--and the implications that the information needs, habits, and attitudes have for libraries seeking to change traditional services and structures.

In this research undertaking We have discovered much that corroborated earlier studies of the information users and uncovered some areas that suggest differences from those studies.

Much of what we learned has value for decision-makers as they attempt to move libraries toward more access services, greater resource sharing, and the full provision--as opposed to acquisition--of information.

In a few words, we can say with some assurance that the information gathering process of our researchers is a will-of-the-wisp, serendipitous, unstructured, informal, and unpredictable process that has to be observed and studied to be appreciated. This is not to say that structured information systems cannot be of great assistance to our researchers, but simply that no system can be expected to meet all of the needs for all of the people all of the time.

2 Informal Sources

The informal aspect of information seeking is perhaps best observed in person-to-person contacts so often mentioned in the responses we received. One faculty member put it well in his comment at the end of the questionnaire (almost as if being prompted): "Some of us create or are parts of informal networks with colleagues at other institutions--these arise in many ways and it might be interesting to investigate their origins and usefulness." It might indeed! In virtually every section of our study, some aspect of informal communication between and among colleagues has surfaced, from the explicit question that opens Section VII through such sections as the use of non-print materials.

3 Dominance of the Journal

Another finding--not a new one, to be sure--is the dominance of the scholarly journal as a medium of information. The journal article is both the most popular and the most convenient form in which to publish and to carry out the research that makes publication possible. Though other formats are heavily used, none have quite the acceptance of the professional journal. It is also used quite frequently as a method of discovery--a finding tool and a source of often unsought but valuable and relevant information.

A corollary finding--one that may differ from other studies-- is that Peabody researchers do not appear to meet a high portion of their information needs through personal subscriptions to personal journals, leaving us to infer that, because of the high importance put upon periodical literature, that the library may well be the prime source of such information. The Peabody faculty do not subscribe to a large number of journals, nor, for that matter, do they appear to have large personal book collections.

4 Reliance on Printed Materials

The heavy reliance upon printed materials at Peabody is coupled with a reluctance to use the new media--or even the older, more established non-print formats such as microforms and audiovisual materials. Whether it was actual information sought, the library tools to get at the information, or the means of maintaining personal information files, there was a decided preference for traditional hardcopy forms. This comes as something of a disappointment in a college that trains our future educators, but there is some hope in the apparent receptiveness to new computerized forms of information access such as online searching or an online catalog. When faced with the selection of non-print materials, the faculty tend to fall back on their favorite tactic: they ask a colleague.

5 Format and Use

In a related finding, convenience of use of a particular format of information appears to influence one's perception of the importance of that format--and that format significantly dictates faculty use. Ease of use may not, ipso facto, make something important, but in this study the problem formats were clearly relegated to a secondary level of value.

6 Low Level of Language Use

The section on languages read and used in research was not included with any expectation that foreign-language facility among the Peabody faculty would be greater than that found in similar surveys. We expected to learn that research materials in other languages are used relatively little but are judged to be demonstrably important in disciplines where knowledge of developments in other cultures is essential. We were unprepared, however, to learn that so many of the faculty are indisposed and unequipped to investigate topics in any language other than their own.

7 Librarians in the Research Process

Another inference from our study is that librarians do not loom large in the faculty member's research process. The librarian is not ranked high among methods of discovering references to relevant published information. Some faculty tend to look to the librarian in times of trouble (e.g., the search for non-print materials) and they are moderately receptive to the idea of a subject specialist librarian to facilitate their research. In the case of the Vanderbilt librarians, it should be said that the faculty do not tend to associate them with problems in finding the information they need--a mild compliment, perhaps, but not to be passed up.

8 Other Findings

Other findings worthy of mention include the following:

- Timeliness of information sources is highly important to researchers in education and related fields.
- Some of the problems identified with library use may be susceptible to concentrated attention by library staff and administrators.
- Library browsing is apparently not as frequent a means of accidental discovery of information as are a number of other methods.
- Libraries other than one's own are not significant sources of research sources for the Peabody faculty.

9 Suggestions for Further Study

One of our hardest lessons was dealing with the immense amount of data generated by a seemingly simple eight-page questionnaire. The enormity of the task of analyzing hundreds of individual responses grouped under a variety of demographic variables has no visible end. This report has merely touched on the findings emerging from the questionnaire. We are just beginning to break down the data into age groups, departments, and other categories for cross-tabular analysis. We hope, in our continuing analysis of the data on hand, to explore differences in the responses according to some of these variables and to subject them to statistics tests.

We also see possibilities for comparative studies with other schools of education and with the Psychology Department of Vanderbilt's College of Arts and Science. One of the investigators plans to correlate data generated in this study with information being gathered for a research project which is part of the UCLA Senior Fellows Program. The project, an analysis of citations found in Peabody faculty publications and their relationship to library holdings, was chosen with the present investigation in mind.

10 Final Comments on the Survey

Perhaps our most inevitable finding was one which all purveyers of questionnaires encounter: the infinite possibilities for ambiguity that such an instrument contains in the hands of a college professor. The first point of contention, of course, is the deadline, which signals the time the faculty member has to do nothing with the questionnaire that has just landed on his or her desk. Only with a follow-up note can the investigator get the full attention of his subject, which in turn may need to be followed by a third note or even a phone call. One good friend waited until far beyond the deadline and then sent a note expressing his profound apology and asking how he could atone. When told by return note that he still had time to get in his questionnaire, he lapsed once more into inert silence.

Some professors and researchers, we were reminded, simply do not read. When asked the date he received his terminal degree, one professor responded with "Yes." Another kindly agreed to participate in a follow-up interview later in the semester but was safe in the offer: that person did not give us his/her name.

Despite these small problems, we would like to express special thanks to those 83 faculty who took the time to fill out our questionnaire and who, in most cases, took the responsibility seriously. They gave us a good portion of their time to make our study possible, and they added sufficient comments to show their interest in what we were trying to do. When at the end of the questionnaire we asked if our respondents had any additional comments, one replied, "Only how much we all need help with this--including some tutoring on more efficient reading strategies (too much to read)!!!!!!!" Here we have a person suffering from information overload who can be helped, and we hope that our study will do just that for him and for all who share such an attitude.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY

QUESTIONNAIRE

INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY

An Investigation into the Information Needs, Habits, and Attitudes of the Faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University

Made Possible by a Grant from the
Council on Library Resources

Edwin S. Gleaves
Co-principal Investigator

Jordan M. Scepanski
Co-principal Investigator

Carla Mazzini
Research Associate

Department of Library and Information Science
George Peabody College for Teachers
Vanderbilt University

1984

INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY

QUESTIONNAIRE

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please provide the information requested below by filling in the blanks.

1. a. Name: ____

   b. Age group:
      21-30 _____
      31-40 _____
      41-50 _____
      51-60 _____
      61- _____

2. Year you received your terminal degree: _____

3. Year you were first employed as a teacher or researcher in higher education: _____

4. a. Department where currently employed: ________________________________

   b. Date of employment in the department: ______________________

   c. Present rank: ______________________________

   d. Year you were appointed to your present rank: ____________

5. During a typical week in the semester, what percentage of your time (approximately) do you spend in teaching (including class preparation, etc.)? _____%; research? _____%; other (please specify)? _________________________ _____%.

If you have conducted research in the past six months, please answer the questions in the following section (Research Information Needs). If you have not, please skip this section and go to the third section entitled "General Information Needs."

II. RESEARCH INFORMATION NEEDS

The following three questions are essential for providing information on types of research and the materials needed for research. Please answer these questions, even if you are able to give only a rough approximation.

In answering questions concerning research, please focus upon research projects you are currently working on or have recently completed.

1. Please check any of the following which are likely to result from your research, or which have already done so.

	Likely to result	Already completed
Thesis for higher degree	_____	_____
Book for which you are an author	_____	_____
Contribution to a book	_____	_____
Edition or translation of another author's work	_____	_____
Other publication of which you are an editor	_____	_____
Journal article	_____	_____
Conference paper	_____	_____
Other please specify: ____________________	_____	_____

2. What are the "raw materials" of your research? Please rate the following according to their importance to your research.

	Circle nos. as appropriate not -------> most important important
a. Unpublished documents (archives, unpublished survey data, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5
b. Published documents (books, periodicals, government publications, newspapers, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5

c. Experiment and/or observation carried out by yourself or under your direction	1	2	3	4	5
d. Interview or questionnaire survey conducted by yourself or under your direction	1	2	3	4	5
e. Mathematical model or computer simulation	1	2	3	4	5
f. Computer data tapes	1	2	3	4	5
g. Other please specify: ________________ ____________	1	2	3	4	5

3. Please rate, as best you can, each of the following kinds of information according to their importance to your research.
(N.B. These categories are not intended to be mutually exclusive: i.e., the same information can be both historical and statistical).

	not important		------->		most important
a. Historical (i.e., relating to historical events)	1	2	3	4	5
b. Descriptive (e.g., use of microcomputers in teaching mathematics)	1	2	3	4	5
c. Statistical (i.e. actual statistics or numerical data)	1	2	3	4	5
d. Methodological (indications or examples of methods or approaches which might be applicable to your research)	1	2	3	4	5
e. Conceptual (theories, ideas, philosophical frameworks, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
f. Other please specify: ____________________________	1	2	3	4	5

III. GENERAL INFORMATION NEEDS

1. Information can be made available in various forms. Please rate each of the following according to their importance in all of your information needs -- research, teaching, professional activities and development, committee assignments, etc. -- by circling the appropriate number on each rating scale.

	not important		------->		most important
a. Periodicals	1	2	3	4	5
b. Books (monographs) or pamphlets	1	2	3	4	5
c. Books (collections such as conference proceedings, collected readings in a subject, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
d. Research reports	1	2	3	4	5
e. Theses, dissertations	1	2	3	4	5
f. Newspapers (daily or weekly)	1	2	3	4	5
g. Government publications and other official documents (e.g., U.N.)	1	2	3	4	5
h. Microforms (e.g., film, fiche, or microprint)	1	2	3	4	5
i. Maps	1	2	3	4	5
j. Films (pictorial, not films of printed material)	1	2	3	4	5
k. Other pictorial (e.g., photographs or illustrations)	1	2	3	4	5
l. Tape recording or other sound recording	1	2	3	4	5
m. Video-tape	1	2	3	4	5
n. Computer printouts, tapes, disks, or cards	1	2	3	4	5
o. Radio or television	1	2	3	4	5
p. Conferences	1	2	3	4	5
q. Colleagues at your own institution (by discussion, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
r. Colleagues or experts elsewhere (other than at conferences, i.e., by corresdence or discussion)	1	2	3	4	5

a. Other
please specify: ______________________ 1 2 3 4 5

2. Of the forms you have used, which THREE do you find easiest or most convenient to use? (Use letters from previous question, and list in any order.) (This question is concerned with the usability of the forms, not their accessibility.)

a. ______
______
______

b. And which three least convenient?
______
______
______

3. There are several methods of discovering references to relevant published information. Please rate, as best you can, the following according to their importance to you in research and teaching.

		not important				most important
a.	Abstracts or indexes (e.g., Current Index to Journals in Education)	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Discussion or correspondence with colleagues on campus or elsewhere	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Library catalogues	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Library's recent acquisitions lists	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Searching library shelves: in your own institution	1	2	3	4	5
f.	in other libraries	1	2	3	4	5
g.	Consulting librarian	1	2	3	4	5
h.	Specialized bibliographies published as separate items (e.g., Resources for Teaching Mathematics in Bilingual Classrooms)	1	2	3	4	5
i.	Bibliographies or references (i.e., citations) in books or periodicals	1	2	3	4	5
j.	Book reviews	1	2	3	4	5
k.	Scanning professional journals	1	2	3	4	5
l.	Publishers' or booksellers' catalogues and announcements	1	2	3	4	5
m.	Online bibliographic services (computer searches)	1	2	3	4	5
n.	Selective dissemination of information services (e.g., distribution of photocopies of tables of contents)	1	2	3	4	5
o.	Other please specify: ______________________	1	2	3	4	5

4. If you use films, sound recordings, computer data bases, microforms, or other "non-book" materials, how do you find out about their existence?

Abstracts and indexes ______
Specialized bibliographies ______
Consulting librarian ______
Other
please specify: ________________________________

5. If you are interested in a certain article, you can now find out what articles have subsequently cited it. This may be a more effective way of finding material on a subject than through conventional abstracting or indexing journals, since it avoids the problems of classification and terminology. Do you think that this sort of tool (a "citation index" such as Social Science Citation Index) would be useful to you? Please indicate its degree of usefulness by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

not -------> most
useful useful
1 2 3 4 5

6. How important is it to you to know what is being published very soon after publication?

not -------> most
important important
1 2 3 4 5

7. How much delay is generally tolerable (extreme cases excepted) to you between the publication of an article or paper in print and its appearance in a published indexing or abstracting journal such as *Psychological Abstracts* and *Social Sciences and Humanities Index*?

Up to one month ______
One to three months ______
Three to six months ______
Six months to one year ______
Over one year ______

8. How much would your ability to gather information be facilitated by the following circumstances:

	none				a great deal
a. Having access in your department to an online computerized catalog of the library's holdings	1	2	3	4	5
b. Having access to other major research libraries' holdings via office or department terminals	1	2	3	4	5
c. Having in your department a computer output microfiche (COM) edition of all periodical holdings in the Vanderbilt libraries	1	2	3	4	5
d. Having a fee-based online service in your department for accessing the major computerized indexing and abstracting services	1	2	3	4	5
e. Receiving automatic updates of previous computer searches (SDI's)	1	2	3	4	5
f. Having at your disposal the services of a subject specialist librarian with a detailed knowledge of bibliographies, abstracts and indexes, databases, libraries, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
g. Having new formats of information available through the library (such as microcomputer software and data file tapes)	1	2	3	4	5
h. Being able to check out current journals from the library (i.e., this year's issues)	1	2	3	4	5
i. Being able to check out bound journals	1	2	3	4	5
j. Receiving photocopies of the tables of contents of current journals	1	2	3	4	5
k. Receiving delivery of library materials to your office upon request	1	2	3	4	5
l. Receiving photocopies of articles from journals	1	2	3	4	5

IV. PERSONAL INFORMATION RESOURCES

1. How many volumes (approximately) directly related to your research and teaching do you own personally?

Fewer than 100 ______
101 - 200 ______
201 - 300 ______
301 - 400 ______
401 - 500 ______
501 - 600 ______
601 - 700 ______
701 - 800 ______
801 - 900 ______
901 - 1000 ______
more than 1000 ______

2. To how many professional journals do you subscribe?

1 - 5 ______
6 - 10 ______
11 - 15 ______
16 - 20 ______
21 - 25 ______
more than 25 ______

3. When you undertake a research project, in what form(s) do you maintain your file of references? Please check whatever forms apply.

Index cards ______
Typed or printed lists ______
Photocopies of documents ______
Microcomputer database ______
Mainframe computer database ______
Other (please specify) ____________________________

V. LIBRARY USE

1. For a typical month during the semester, about how many visits do you make to the Vanderbilt libraries?

Number of visits ______

2. Which libraries or collections in the Vanderbilt library system have you used, whether for borrowing or consultation?

	not used -------			>	most used
a. Central Library	1	2	3	4	5
b. Divinity Library	1	2	3	4	5
c. Education Library	1	2	3	4	5
d. Law Library	1	2	3	4	5
e. Medical Center Library	1	2	3	4	5
f. Music Library	1	2	3	4	5
g. Observatory Library	1	2	3	4	5
h. Management Library	1	2	3	4	5
i. Science Library	1	2	3	4	5
j. Special Collections	1	2	3	4	5
k. Television News Archive	1	2	3	4	5

3. How adequate for your research and teaching are the collections of the Vanderbilt University Libraries?

	Totally Inadequate		---->		Fully Adequate
Research	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching	1	2	3	4	5

4. Of the library books and periodicals you have used, what proportion (roughly) have you borrowed from libraries other than those of Vanderbilt?

Percent
0 ______
1 - 10 ______
11 - 25 ______
26 - 50 ______
51 - 75 ______
76 - 90 ______
more than 90 ______

5. Please rate the importance of the following sources to your research and teaching:

	not important -------			>	most important
Materials from your own resources	1	2	3	4	5
Materials obtained from Vanderbilt University Libraries	1	2	3	4	5
Materials obtained from other libraries	1	2	3	4	5

6. a. In seeking the information you need from the Vanderbilt libraries, to what extent have you encountered problems with the following?

	frequently a problem		--->		never a problem
Materials not owned by the Vanderbilt University Libraries	1	2	3	4	5
Materials not at their designated locations	1	2	3	4	5
Non-circulating materials	1	2	3	4	5

Length of interlibrary loan periods	1	2	3	4	5
Length of time to acquire items on interlibrary loan	1	2	3	4	5
Service or knowledge of the library staff	1	2	3	4	5

b. To what extent have you been able to solve these problems?

not at all ----> fully
1 2 3 4 5

7. How would you rate the following in terms of their value to you in searching for materials:

	low value ------>				high value
a. Library card catalogs	1	2	3	4	5
b. Printed bibliographies	1	2	3	4	5
c. Printed indexes and abstracts	1	2	3	4	5
d. Online computerized indexing and abstracting services	1	2	3	4	5
e. Online computerized catalogue (e.g., OCLC)	1	2	3	4	5

8. a. "Accidental discovery" is a common experience in research. How often have you picked up material by accident or by purposeful browsing?

	never ----->				often
By browsing through library stacks	1	2	3	4	5
By scanning current periodicals	1	2	3	4	5
By looking up a given reference and spotting something else at the same time	1	2	3	4	5
Through offprints or pamphlets	1	2	3	4	5
In book stores	1	2	3	4	5
In conversation with colleagues	1	2	3	4	5
Through mass media	1	2	3	4	5
In other ways please specify: ________________________	1	2	3	4	5

b. How important to you are materials found in this way?

not -------> most
important important
1 2 3 4 5

9. Do you require access for your research and teaching to books published:

	never ----->				often
Before 1900	1	2	3	4	5
1901 - 1950	1	2	3	4	5
1951 - 1960	1	2	3	4	5
1961 - 1970	1	2	3	4	5
1971 - 1980	1	2	3	4	5
1981 -	1	2	3	4	5

10. Do you require access for your research and teaching to any periodicals published:

	never ----->				often
Before 1965	1	2	3	4	5
1965 - 1970	1	2	3	4	5
1971 - 1975	1	2	3	4	5
1976 - 1980	1	2	3	4	5
1981 -	1	2	3	4	5

VI. LANGUAGES USED IN RESEARCH

1. What languages (other than English) do you read that are important to your research and teaching?

French ______
German ______
Spanish ______
Other
please specify: ________________________________

2. Do you regularly scan literature in these languages? (e.g., by looking through current periodicals)

Yes ______
No ______

3. If you come across a reference to, or abstract of, an item which appears to be relevant to your work, and it is in a foreign language that you can read, do you have any reluctance to look up the original?

No more than if it were in English ______
Slightly more than if it were in English ______
Considerably more than if it were in English ______

4. If you come across a reference (not an abstract) to an item which you believe to be relevant, and it is in a foreign language that you do not read, what do you do?

	Usually	Only if believed to be very important
(a) If the original is easily accessible:		
Try to get it translated	______	______
Try to get the gist of it yourself	______	______
Search for a summary or abstract	______	______
Ignore it	______	
(b) If the original is not easily accessible:		
Search for a summary or abstract	______	______
Try to obtain on interlibrary loan		
to get the gist yourself	______	______
to get it translated	______	______
Ignore it	______	

5. Is your choice of a research subject affected by what you believe to be the amount of English-language material on the subject? (e.g., are you less likely to choose a subject in which there is a high proportion of foreign-language material?)

Yes ______
No ______

6. Do you consider that your work has been restricted or constrained in any way because of the language problem?

not at all ----> substantially
1 2 3 4 5

VII. INFORMAL SOURCES

1. a. To what extent do you keep in touch with colleagues in other institutions?

never -----> often
1 2 3 4 5

b. If you do keep in touch, please rate the value to you of the following methods of exchanging information:

	no value	-------->			most value
Exchange of offprints	1	2	3	4	5
Circulation of unpublished MSS	1	2	3	4	5
Written correspondence	1	2	3	4	5
Correspondence through electronic newsletters, electronic mail, or electronic bulletin boards	1	2	3	4	5
"Social" contacts (e.g. personal visits, telephone, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

2. a. How many professional meetings or conferences have you attended in the last twelve months?

Local ______
State ______
Regional ______
National ______
International ______

b. If you did attend a conference, how valuable was the information you gained there to your work?

no value --------->				great value
1	2	3	4	5

c. Of what value was the information gained from:

	no --------->				great
Papers presented	1	2	3	4	5
Discussions	1	2	3	4	5
Informal contacts	1	2	3	4	5
Exhibits	1	2	3	4	5

4. Please rate the following according to their value as a stimulus or source of new ideas for your research:

	no value --------->				most value
Research itself (your own)	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching	1	2	3	4	5
Discussions with colleagues	1	2	3	4	5
Reading	1	2	3	4	5
Conferences	1	2	3	4	5
Other					

please specify: ______________________________

5. a. Do you delegate any of your searching for references or materials to anyone else?

Yes ____
No ____

b. To whom? (Mark all that apply)

Graduate assistant ____
Students in classes ____
Other ____

c. To what extent?

Extensively ____
Partially ____

VIII. COMMENTS AND FOLLOW-UP

1. Do you have any additional general comments you would like to make on the problems of finding out what information exists? Or do you have any suggestions to make as to how the provision of information, and access to it, could be improved?

2. Would you agree to participate in a follow-up interview later this semester?
Yes ____
No ____

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

RESPONDENTS' COMMENTS ON QUESTIONNAIRE[1]

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

5. During a typical week in the semester, what percentage of your time (approximately) do you spend in teaching (including class preparation, etc.)? _____%; research? _____%; other (please specify)? ________________________ _____%

- Program administration--25%
- Student advising--25%
- Administration--70%
- Administration--50%
- Assoc. Dir. of Corporate Learning Institute--33%
- Committee work--35%
- Administration--90%
- Administration--70%
- Administration--80% (teaching 40% summers)
- Administration--70%
- Working with individual doctoral students, committees for doctoral students; departmental committees--50%

---

[1] The main sections and the questions themselves appear in italics. See the questionnaire itself (Appendix A) for the other parts of the questions, which are indicated by ellipses. Comments have been interpolated as necessary for the sake of uniformity. Question marks in brackets indicate illegible responses.

- Various programs and project administration--40%
- Committee meetings. Reading student work--25%
- Principals Insitute--15%
- Directing dissertations, supervising internships, advising--30%
- Giving workshops; taking related courses, e.g., computer programming courses; attending conferences--20%
- Administration--Economics and Social Studies Center--50%
- Department and college committees--25%
- Committees, administrivia--25%
- Advising/committees [?????] Supervising--20%
- Administration--75%
- Committees--20%
- Administration--20%
- Student advising--25%
- Teacher training--30%
- Administrative garbage--30%
- Administration--50%
- Committees (college, department)--20%
- Committees, professional organizations--15%
- Administration and service--10%
- Administration, departmental activities--45%
- Administration--33%
- Director of Graduate Studies; various committees--25%
- Clinical work--50%
- Advising, committee work, etc.--30%
- Administration--25%

- Student advising; administrative chores--25%
- Advising, committee work, etc.--25%
- Service--25%
- Administration--20%
- Administration and faculty affairs--65%
- Advisement and committees--20%
- Supervision--30%
- Writing, meetings--30%
- Committees--10%
- Service--5%
- Administration, supervision--25%
- Administrative, self-improvement--10%
- Committee work--30%
- Administration--85%
- Departmental duties, workshops, etc.--45%
- Service, administration, committees--35%
- Administrative duties--35%
- Editorial boards, dissertation advisement, departmental and college committees--33%
- Inst [?] in class with students--5%
- Administrative--75%
- Writing--30%
- Clinical service--50%
- Administration--65%
- Administration--90%
- Administration--75%

II. RESEARCH INFORMATION NEEDS

1. Please check any of the following which are likely to result from your research, or which have already done so.

....

Other
*please specify:*____________

- National report to the secretary of education
- Research final report
- Staff training
- Technical report
- Class preparation [also checked "Already completed"]
- Media product [also checked "Likely to result"]
- Policy report [also checked "Likely to result"]
- Position paper [also checked "Already completed"]

2. What are the "raw materials" of your research? Please rate the following according to their importance to your research.

....
[Each is followed by a five-point scale.]

g. Other
please specify: ______________________________

- Computer searches of information
- Computer
- Product specifications, technical product data
- Other published books and articles

3. *Please rate, as best you can, each of the following kinds of information according to their importance to your research. N.B. These categories are not intended to be mutually exclusive: i.e., the same information can be both historical and statistical.*

....

[Each is followed by a five-point scale.]

f. Other
please specify: ------------------------------

- Poor question. Meaning of question vague.

- Other studies (I do a lot of synthesis.)

- Legal (case reporters)

III. GENERAL INFORMATION NEEDS

1. *Information can be made available in various forms. Please rate each of the following according to their importance in all of your information needs--research, teaching, professional activities and development, committee assignments, etc.--by circling the appropriate number on each rating scale.*

....

[Each is followed by a five-point scale.]

s. Other
please specify: ______________

- Student papers, bibliographies

- Information from industry source, product data

3. *There are several methods of discovering references to relevant published information. Please rate, as best you can, the following according to their importance to you in research and teaching.*

....
[Each is followed by a five-point scale.]

- Research assistant

- Discussion with students

4. *If you use films, sound recordings, computer data bases, microforms, or other "non-book" materials, how do you find out about their existence?*

....

Other
please specify: ______________________________

- Bad question. Can't be answered in the format you give.

- Colleagues

- Don't really use except bibliographies, data bases, e.g., DIALOG.

- Consult colleagues; contact government

- Colleagues

- Professional journal reviews

- Advertising flyers

- Commercial ads and brochures

- Through American Red Cross or N.A.T.A. (National Athletic Trainers Association)

- Professional journals. Media Center. Music Library.

- Advertisements
- Colleagues
- Colleagues
- Review journal
- Colleagues elsewhere
- Ads sent out by publishers
- Colleagues
- Advertisements
- Colleagues
- Word of mouth and advertising
- Colleagues
- Other persons using them
- Discussions with students and colleagues
- Professional journals
- Publishers catalogs

IV. PERSONAL INFORMATION RESOURCES

3. When you undertake a research project, in what form(s) do you maintain your file of references? Please check whatever forms apply.

……

Other (please specify) ______________________________

- Piles on tables
- Looseleaf notebook
- Computerized literature search printouts

- Pieces of scrap paper in my shirt pocket and billfold

V. LIBRARY USE

8. a. "Accidental discovery is a common experience in research. How often have you picked up material by accident or by purposeful browsing?

....

[Each is rated from "never" to "often."]

In other ways
please specify: ______________________________

- Professional newsletters and weekly reports
- Colleagues office
- Correspondence with colleagues
- Discussion with students

VI. LANGUAGES USED IN RESEARCH

1. What languages (other than English) do you read that are important to your research and teaching?

- I have made very little use of non-translated works
- Read French but not important to research
- Read French--none important
- [Checked French and German]--but not important
- [Checked German]--not but not important to teaching or reseach
- No foreign language used in teaching or research

3. If you come across a reference to, or abstract of, an item which appears to be relevant to your work, and it is in a foreign language that you can read, do you have any reluctance to look up the original?

- I read German, but my scientific vocabulary is particularly inadequate.

4. If you come across a reference (not an abstract) to an item which you believe to be relevant, and it is in a foreign lanuage that you do not read, what do you do?

- No experience with this problem.

5. Is your choice of a research subject affected by what you believe to be the amount of English-language material on the subject? (e.g., are you less likely to choose a subject in which there is a high proportion of foreign-language material?)

- [Checked yes] Probably, but I don't recall ever having made the choice.
- [Checked no] But the subjects I'm interested in have plenty of information in English.
- This question doesn't seem applicable to me.

VII. INFORMAL SOURCES

If you do keep in touch [with colleagues in other institutions], please rate the value to you of the following methods of exchanging information.

....

Correspondence through electronic newletters, electonic mail, or electronic bulletin boards

No experience [Marked 1]

Not done

N/A

N/A

Doesn't happen [Marked 1]

4. *Please rate the following according to their value as a stimulus or source of new ideas for your research:*

....

[Each is rated from "no value" to "most value."]

Other
please specify: ______________________________

- I have not conducted any research except as an aid in my teaching.
- Visiting schools
- Discussions with students
- At present I do no research.

5. a. Do you delegate any of your searching for references or materials to anyone else?

Yes _____
No _____

b. To whom? (Mark all that apply)

Graduate assistant _____
Students in classes _____
Other _____

- Library assistant

- Secretary

- I employ them directly

- Colleagues

VIII. COMMENTS AND FOLLOW-UP

1. Do you have any additional general comments you would like to make on the problems of finding out what information exists? Or do you have any suggestions to make as to how the provision of information, or access to it, could be improved?

- You've got to be kidding. Keep it shorter please.

- Please consider whether or not I should be in your sample population. I am 80% administrative, 15% as research associate at VIPPS [Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies], and teach one time a year.

- Hard to read. Change your paper color. Shorten your instrument.

- I am frankly and unfortunately not familiar enough with the potential of the computer in library work.

- I believe I should clarify--the courses I teach or will teach in the future are in areas for which there are governing groups* that maintain libraries and make it a point to educate those professionals in their groups concerning new and pertinent discoveries. They both have audio and video and printed material libraries that serve my needs well. (*American Red Cross and National Athletic Trainers Association)

- My current activities are not especially relevent to this.

- I'm just not familiar enough with this system yet to make any comments.

- Need more books that are compilations of conferences and/or edited review books.

- One of our most serious problems is having to go to each library to see if an item is in the collection. The centralized computer card catalogue has failed us, perhaps six or more times. Second the policy of being unable to retrieve materials held by faculty who don't return it--that needs serious attention. Third, better access to computer-based databases--cost is often the problem.

- Anything to make it faster: computerized card and location catalog with information as to whether a book or journal is in. How do you decide what books and journals to take (buy)?

- I think it's ridiculous that a private company like Kinko's can charge 4 1/2 cents per photocopy, but our own libraries charge faculty and students an exhorbitant 10 cents per page.

- Provide Xeroxing and computer searches on departmental budgets.

- Library could acquire more than one copy of some books.

- Current Contents, published by Social Science Citation Index, has been invaluable in keeping up with literature when I have been in other locations. I strongly urge us getting it in Psychology and Clinical areas. Most abstracting systems don't give enough information to write for reprints; it's wonderful to simply hand Current Contents to a secretary to request a reprint.

- I'd like to know what films and videotapes are available on campus.

- Only how much we all need to help with this--including some tutoring on more efficient reading strategies (too much to read)!!!

- This may not be appropriate for me as I am only a part-time adjunct instructor. Data may not be relevant or interpretable. I teach one course every now and then.

- Any assistance in initial searching.

- Because my major responsibility is for the coordination of field work in the school, my major use of the library is the Curriculum Laboratory. Materials related to teaching procedure and practical application are those which I am most interested in.

- More publicizing of Peabody research clearinghouse--and closer connection of it with Education Library.

- Some of us create or are parts of informal networks with colleagues at other institutions--these arise in many way and it might be interesting to investigate their origins and usefulness.

- Psychology journals are spread over Central library in confusing manner. Education Library is much easier to use.

- Decentralizing computer services for computation and searches could increase research activity dramatically--opinion!

APPENDIX C

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY: INTRODUCTION

This bibliography was prepared as the first step in the research project and was revised as the project progressed. Working initially from printed bibliographies, lists generated through online services, and references in pertinent articles and books, the research associate scanned numerous items and chose relevant ones for inclusion in the bibliography. Items were judged relevant when they dealt theoretically or practically with information-gathering habits and attitudes, user needs and satisfaction, user studies, methodology in use studies, or questionnaire design, or if they contained important bibliograpies.

Materials were then ranked on a ten-point scale with "1" indicating items of most immediate relevance to our project (not reflecting, necessarily, the quality of the publication itself). In addition to full bibliographic citation and rank, each item in the bibliography was identified by subject or subjects covered, location and call number (if applicable), and source of citation;

most entries also included a comment section in which its most salient characteristics were described.

As the research project moved forward, new items were added upon the investigators' recommendations, and those items considered of periferal interest were deleted from the bibliography. Thus the extent of this selective bibliography is a manageable one, reflecting the more focused aspects of our project and not user studies in general. Such a task we leave to another generation.

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Rating System: 1 through 10. The following materials are ranked according to their relevance to either information-gathering habits or survey methodologies and design. 1 is the highest ranking and 10 is the lowest.

100 indicates materials that may be of use at a later time. The numbers following in parentheses are rating numbers. 101 indicates a bibliography.

Allen, Thomas J. "Information Needs and Uses." In Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, v. 4, pp. 3-29. Edited by Carlos A. Cuadra. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1969.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z699 .A1 A65 v. 4

Subject: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: This chapter, "Information Needs and Uses," is often included in editions of the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST). Each time a different reviewer covers publications concerning information needs and uses.

In this chapter, Allen focuses mostly on information needs and uses in science, and he stresses "the scientist as an information processor and communicator within a work team, professional society, invisible college, or other organization" (Crawford, ARIST, v. 13, p. 61).

The "Information" chapters of the early volumes of ARIST concern science primarily, although mention is sometimes made of studies on social science information-gathering habits. As time goes on, much more attention is given to the social sciences as will be seen in following citations. In order to avoid missing anything important, however, I have included all "Information" chapters that appear in ARIST in this bibliography. (CM)

Source: Ford, User Studies....

Allen, Thomas J. Managing the Flow of Technology: Technology Transfer and the Dissemination of Technological Information within the R&D Organization. Boston: MIT, 1977.

Location: Mngt. T174.3 .A44

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs; Questionnaires

Rank: 2

Comment: This study contains the results of a "program of 'research on research'" (Acknowledgements). Among other topics, the author investigates the "information-gathering habits" (p. 8) of scientists and engineers. Many sections of the book which concern information-gathering habits and methodologies used to ascertain those habits may be applicable to our project. Highly readable. Appended "Communications Survey Questionnaire" is excellent; it has been photocopied and is on file. (CM)

Source: Blagden, "Benefit Assessment . . ."

Association of Research Libraries. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. External Communication. Washington, D.C.: Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, 1979.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z678.88 .E973

Subjects: User satisfaction; User needs; Questionnaires

Rank: 1

Comment: "Kit 56 . . . contains statistical results of the SPEC survey on external communication, 4 documents concerning policies, procedures, and recommendations, 12 examples of communications within university administration and faculty, and 11 examples of communication with library users" (Preface). N.B. faculty questionnaires, pp. 60-68.

Source: --

Association of Research Libraries. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. User Surveys and Evaluation of Library Services. Washington, D.C.: Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, 1981.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z711.3 .U837

Subjects: User satisfaction; User needs; Questionnaires

Rank: 1

Comment: "SPEC Kit #71 . . . contains seven examples of general user surveys and eight examples of user surveys on specific issues" (Preface). Emory survey contains some useful questions, pp. 57-63. Summary of Cornell survey "to determine the libraries' research support performance and capabilities" (p. vi) looks interesting; may be helpful to see copies of Cornell's questionnaire which is not included here. (CM)

Source: --

Auster, Ethel. "Organizational Behavior and Information Seeking: Lessons for Librarians." Special Libraries 73 (July 1982): 173-82.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Information-gathering habits

Rank: 2

Comment: Auster gets directly into "information-seeking behavior" on pp. 178-80 of this article. Most helpful are her summaries of major points made in articles or studies by Paisley, Line, and others. (Many of these refer to the "Information Needs and Uses" chapters that appear from time to time in the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology -- ARIST). Very good list of references. (CM)

Source: --

Bath University Library. Investigation into Information Requirements of the Social Sciences: Research Report 1. Bath: Bath University Library, 1971.

Location: ILL (photocopy on file)

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs; Questionnaires

Rank: 1**

Comment: The most important study I've seen yet. It relates more closely to our research than any other material I've looked at so far. It is a report on the research findings of a study covering the "information needs of social science researchers, and of teachers in social science departments of universities" (p. i) in England. It investigates almost every possible source from which scholars gather information -- from use of books and journals, indexes, and abstracts to more informal methods such as chats with colleagues, conference attendance, accidental discoveries, etc. The report thoroughly describes the study's methodology and results. It includes, too, an excellent questionnaire (photocopied and on file). We have a photocopy on file of volume I (complete) and selections of tables from volume II. (CM)

Source: --

Blagden, John. "Benefit Assessment Methodology: The Key Priority for Library Research." In Library Effectiveness: A State of the Art, pp. 26-33. New York: Library Administration and Management Assoc./ALA, 1980.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z678.85 .L52 1980

Subjects: User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: As the title indicates, Blagden discusses benefit assessment methodology in this article; however, it might be a good idea to read relevant sections in his book first (following citation). (CM)

Source: --

Blagden, John. Do We Really Need Libraries? An Assessment of Approaches to the Evaluation of the Performance of Libraries. New York: K. G. Saur, 1980.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z678.85 .B523

Subjects: User needs

Rank: 1

Comment: Discusses use of marketing approach in assessing user needs. Very good bibliography (on file). (CM)

Source: --

Blagden, John F. "Libraries and Corporate Performance: The Elusive Connection." In New Trends in Documentation and Information: Proceedings of the 39th FID Congress, University of Edinburgh, 25-28 September 1978, pp. 379-82. Edited by Peter J. Taylor. London: Aslib for FID, 1980.

Location: ILL (photocopy on file)

Subjects: User needs

Rank: 4

Comment: Discusses some approaches to cost benefit assessments of library systems and the problems of measuring benefits. Concludes by briefly describing his own method in which he uses techniques of market analysis. (CM).

Source: --

Boaz, Martha, ed. Strategies for Meeting the Information Needs of Society in the Year 2000. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1981.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z674.7 .S76

Subjects: User needs

Rank: 5

Comment: This book contains articles by various persons on problems and "strategies for developing information technologies.... The general outline of the book centers upon practical plans for meeting the information needs of society with emphasis on user needs, economics, technology, and legal issues" (Pref.). Boaz points out the need for the type of research we are doing (identifying user needs) in the concluding chapter, pp. 181-2.

Source: --

Bookstein, Arthur. "On the Complexities of Asking Questions: Difficulties in Interpretation of Library Surveys." In Library Effectiveness: A State of the Art, pp. 35-48. New York: Library Administration and Management Assoc./ ALA, 1980.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z678.85 .L52 1980

Subjects: Questionnaires

Rank: 1

Comment: Discusses problems of wording in survey instruments. (CM)

Source: --

Bradburn, N.M., and Ludman, S. Improving Interview Method and Questionnaire Design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Location: Mngt. HN29 .B66

Subjects: Survey instrument design

Rank: 100 (2)

Comment: As indicated in the preface, this study mainly concerns response effects to threatening questions. However, the study appears useful as a guide in preparing questions to be used on questionnaires and in interviews. (CM).

Source: Bookstein, "On the Complexities of Asking Questions...."

Broadus, Robert N. "The Literature of the Social Sciences: A Survey of Citation Studies." International Social Science Journal 23 (1971): 236-243.

Location: Central Lib. Per.

Subjects: Information sources.

Rank: 2

Comment: Broadus reviews and compares the findings of a number of citation studies done on social sciences literature. Of major interest are subjects cited, languages used, forms of publication used, and age of literature used. (CM)

Source: --

Buckland, M.K. Book Availability and the Library User. New York: Pergamon Press, 1975.

Location: Lib. Sci. 025.5 B856b

Subjects: User satisfaction; User needs

Rank: 8

Comment: Concerns: "logistical problems of making books available to library users" (Intro.); library stock control; how much material should be acquired and how many copies; how long materials should be kept. (CM)

Source: --

Chapin, Richard E. "Limits of Self-Sufficiency." In Proceedings of the Conference on Interlibrary Communications and Information Networks. p. 56 ff. Edited by Joseph Becker. Chicago: American Library Assoc., 1971.

Location: Lib. Sci. 021.65 B388i

Subjects: User satisfaction; User needs

Rank: 4

Comment: Discusses distinctions between physical and bibliographic self-sufficiency; discusses advantages and problems of networking. Background reading. (CM)

Source: --

Chen, Ching-chih, and Hernon, Peter. "Library Effectiveness in Meeting Information Consumer's Needs." In Library Effectiveness: A State of the Art, pp. 49-62. New York: Library Administration and Management Assoc./ALA, 1980.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z678.85 .L52 1980

Subjects: Information-gathering habits

Rank: 3

Comments: Concerns the general public--not faculty. May be helpful in analogy. (CM)

Source: --

Corkill, Cynthia, and Mann, Margaret. Information Needs in the Humanities: Two Postal Surveys. Sheffield, England: University of Sheffield, Centre for Research on User Studies, 1978.

Location: ILL (photocopy of some parts of study on file)

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs; Questionnaire

Rank: 2

Comment: Explains background and methodology of surveys; describes content of questionnaire and analysis of resulting data. We have a photocopy on file of all text concerning the survey of "academic staff" as well as a copy of the questionnaire used. The questionnaire is fairly detailed and worth examining. (CM).

Source: --

Crane, Diana. "Information Needs and Uses." In Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, v. 6, pp. 3-39. Edited by Carlos A. Cuadra. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1971.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z699 .A1 A65 v. 6

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: A review of the literature "on information needs and uses in the basic sciences" published in 1970 (p. 3); discusses also formal and informal communication among scientists. (CM).

Source: Ford, User Studies; Auster, "Organizational Behavior ...."

Crawford, Susan. "Information Needs and Uses." In Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, v. 13, pp. 61-81. Edited by Martha E. Williams. White Plains, N.Y.: Knowledge Industry Publications, 1978.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z699 .A1 A65 v. 13

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 1

Comment: "This paper reviews 95 publications on information needs and use studies, issued during the period 1975 through 1977, which have been identified from Information Science Abstracts, Library Literature, and informal sources. It will address developments in four major areas: the concepts of information needs and uses, methodology, use studies published during 1975-77, and the uses of information" (62).

Source: Ford, User Studies; Auster, "Organizational Behavior...."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Daehn, Ralph M. "Quo Vadis? Fundamental Reflections on the Future of Academic Libraries." *Collection Management* 3 (Winter 1979): 297-311.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Trends; Technology

Rank: 6

Comment: General discussion -- concerns improved access, networking, technology.

Source: --

Finison, Lorenz J., and Whittemore, Charles L. "Linguistic Isolation of American Social Psychology." *American Psychologist* 30, No. 4 (April 1975): 513-516.

Location: --

Subjects: Use of non-English language materials.

Rank: 2

Comment: Using the findings of citation studies, the authors conclude that social psychologists and some other social scientists (such as those in education) make very little use of foreign language materials. They discuss the ramifications of such "linguistic isolation" on the social scientists' disciplines. (CM)

Source: Morrison

Ford, Geoffrey. *User Studies: An Introductory Guide and Select Bibliography*. Sheffield, England: Center for Research on User Studies, 1977.

Location: ILL

Subjects: User studies

Rank: 1

Comment: This report is "an evaluation of current knowledge in user studies" (Pref. p. vi); intends to describe "state-of-the-art" in user studies by reviewing purposes of previous studies as well as describing methods and types; assesses strengths and shortcomings of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

different methodologies; long bibliography at end; interesting charts throughout. (CM).

Source: --

Ford, N. "Relating 'Information Needs' to Learner Characteristics in Higher Education." Journal of Documentation 36 (June 1980): 99-104.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: User satisfaction; User needs; Information gathering habits

Rank: 1

Comment: Theoretical study of information-gathering habits. (CM) "From a review of systems designated to satisfy information needs of higher education students, it is concluded that generally, the wider range of information that an individual has access to, (i) the more restricted to the names of 'topics' and 'subjects' have been the parameters of information needs catered for by the system; and (ii) the less the individual has been able to know about the suitability of the sources to other parameters of his information needs, as proposed, at the time of searching. Implications are drawn, for students working in the context of relatively independent access to wide ranges of information sources, in terms of the need to develop effective information handling skills; assessment procedures; and information accessing systems" (abstract introduction to article, p. 99).

Source: --

Friends of the UCSD Library. The Responsibility of the University Library Collection in Meeting the Needs of Its Campus and Local Community: A Symposium in Honor of Melvin J. Voight . . . La Jolla, Calif.: Friends of the UCSD Library, 1976.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z675 .U5 R464

Subjects: User needs

Rank: 4

Comment: Interesting general discussion of problems of meeting needs of campus and local community. Background reading. (CM)

Source: --

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Godden, Irene P.; Fachen, Karen W.; and Smith, Patricia A., comps. Collection Development and Acquisitions, 1970-80: An Annotated, Critical Bibliography. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1982.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z689 .G59

Subjects: --

Rank: 101, Bibliography

Comment: --

Source: --

Halperin, Michael. "Determining User Preferences for Information Services." Drexel Library Quarterly 17 (Spring 1981): 88-98.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: User satisfaction; User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: "Reviews the various techniques and methods employed to measure user preferences with respect to the provision of particular library services. The ranking of user preferences, direct judgment methods of measurement, tradeoff analysis, and conjoint analysis are among the topics discussed" (ERIC). Photocopy on file.

Source: ERIC

Halperin, Michael. "Market Segmentation for Information Services." Drexel Library Quarterly 17 (Spring 1981): 76-87.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: Discusses the use of market segmentation in determining user preferences and needs. (CM) Photocopy on file.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Source: --

Herner, Saul, and Herner, Mary. "Information Needs and Uses in Science and Technology." In Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, v. 2, pp. 1-34. Edited by Carlos A. Cuadra. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z699 .Al A65 v. 2

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: Review "covers primarily publications appearing in 1966" (1). Crawford (ARIST, vol. 13) states that in this review "HERNER & HERNER lamented the current approaches of use studies and delineated six valid techniques for gathering data" (p. 61, v. 13). (CM)

Source: Ford, User Studies; Auster, "Organizational Behavior ...."

Immroth, John Phillip. "Information Needs for the Humanities." In Information Science: Search for Identity, pp. 249-262. Edited by Anthony Debons. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1974.

Location: Lib. Sci. 020.8 D352i

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: This article is interesting overall, although the section which seems to concern more specifically the information needs and research methods of humanists takes up pp. 257-261. Background reading. (CM). Abstract at beginning: "The humanities need the methodologies and techniques of information science as employed by the natural and social scientists, especially as the humanities strive to be more functional in their relation to the motives and premises of cultural progress" (p. 249).

Source: Sue Stone, "Humanities...."

Kaske, Neal K. "An Evaluation of Current Collection Utilization Methodologies and Findings." *Collection Management* 3 (Summer/Fall 1979): 187-99.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Library surveys

Rank: 4

Comment: On comparison of the results of library studies: "The use of libraries cannot be compared, but the use of library collections can be compared, if the objectives for the collections are the same, other things being equal" (Kaske, p. 187). Article discusses variables. Background reading. (CM)

Source: --

Krikelas, James. "Information-Seeking Behavior: Patterns and Concepts." *Drexel Library Quarterly* 19 (Spring 1983): 5-20.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Information-gathering habits

Rank: 3

Comment: The title of this article is very promising, but the contents don't really address the concerns of our research in any depth. The article is a general, theoretical discussion of information-seeking behavior (i.e. not specific to any one group such as academicians but instead considering all information seekers). Krikelas defines terms such as "information-seeking behavior," "need," "information gathering," etc. which he thinks are often used imprecisely. "The purpose of this paper," he writes, "is to examine the elements of user studies and to present them as unified concepts within a model of information-seeking behavior"(6). (CM).

Source: --

Lin, Nan, and Garvey, William D. "Information Needs and Uses." In *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*. v. 7, pp. 5-37. Edited by Carlos A. Cuadra. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Information Science, 1972.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z699 .A1 A65 v. 7

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rank: 2

Comment: A review of the "literature reporting information needs and uses" for 1971. Concerns mostly needs and uses in science and technology, but there are some reviews of publications on social sciences. E.g. the University of Bath or INFROSS studies are discussed on pp. 8-10. (CM)

Source: Ford, User Studies; Auster, "Organizational Behavior...."

Line, M.B. "The Ability of a University Library to Provide Books Wanted by Researchers." Journal of Librarianship 5 (1973): 37-51.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: Abstract at beginning of article: "Library 'failures' can be at various levels. This paper is concerned with basic stock failure -- the library's inability to supply items wanted (but not necessarily demanded of the library) by readers. The problems of studying stock failures are reviewed, with reference to two attempts at the University of Bath to identify the references wanted by researchers, the action taken by them on these references, and the ability of the library to supply them" (37). (CM).

Source: --

Line, Maurice B. "Information Needs of the Social Sciences." INSPEL--International Journal of Special Libraries 8, No. 2 (April 1973): 29-39.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: User needs.

Rank: 2

Comment: Line's purpose in this article is "to summarize our present state of knowledge about information needs in the social sciences, . . . to state general principles and factors that should be observed in the design of future information systems, and to suggest lines of future work" (p. 29). (CM)

Source: Morrison

Lipsetz, Ben-Ami. "Information Needs and Uses." In Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, v. 5, pp. 3-32. Edited by Carlos A. Cuadra. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1970.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z699 .A1 A65 v. 5

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: Reviews publications on information needs and uses appearing in 1969. Publications grouped under three headings: "Surveys and Measurements," "Methodology," and "Theory." Concerns mostly the information uses of engineers and scientists although some sections concern social scientists and others.

Source: Ford, User Studies; Auster, "Organizational Behavior...."

Martyn, John. "Information Needs and Uses." In Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, v. 9, pp. 3-21. Edited by Carlos A. Cuadra. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Information Science, 1974.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z699 .A1 A65 v. 9; currently this volume is on Wil Clouse's LIS3820 carrel
Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 1

Comment: Martyn begins his review with a discussion of the development through the 50's, 60's, and early 70's of studies intended to identify "information-gathering habits and needs" of users. The remainder of his review focuses on reports, books, and articles on such studies that were published in 1972 and 1973. His review is valuable for its summary of these works and also valuable for Martyn's criticism and comments. (CM)

Source: Ford, User Studies, and others

Menzel, Herbert. "Information Needs and Uses in Science and Technology." In Annual Review of Information Science and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Technology, v. 1, pp. 41-69. Edited by Carlos A. Cuadra. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z699 .A1 A65 v. 1

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: Review covers studies done from 1963-1965. This is the first chapter in the series of "Information Needs and Uses" chapters appearing from time to time in ARIST.

Source: Ford, User Studies; Auster, "Organizational Behavior...."

Menzel, Herbert. Review of Studies in the Flow of Information Among Scientists. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1960.

Location: ILL (photocopy of selected materials on file)

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: Apparently Menzel is a pioneer in research on information-gathering behavior. His study on the ways scientists gather information is often referred to by current researchers in this area. What is valuable in his methodology for our project has already been adopted and refined in more recent studies which we are using, and therefore it doesn't seem necessary to read his entire work. However, in the second volume of the Review, there are tables for interpretation of data which may provide useful examples. These tables are photocopied and on file. (CM).

Source: --

McBride, Ruth B., and Stenstrom, Patricia. "Psychology Journal Use." Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian 2 (Fall 1982):1-12.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: User needs.

Rank: 2

Comment: "Results of a survey of serial use by psychology faculty at the University of Illinois at

Urbana-Champaign are compared with an American Psychological Association report published in 1963 and with data extracted from 'SSCI Journal Citation Reports,' 1978. The article profiles the relationship between the three and evaluates their usefulness in collection development." (Abstract to article, p. 1)

Source: --

McCaghy, Dawn, and Purcell, Gary R. "Faculty Use of Government Publications." College and Research Libraries 33 (January 1972): 7-12.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Information-gathering habits

Rank: 5

Comment: ERIC abstract: "The findings in a survey of faculty use of government documents at Case Western Reserve University indicate how document users locate the materials they need, the users' familiarity with standard indexes to public documents, the age of government publications most frequently consulted, and other patterns of use." This article doesn't seem that relevant to our research in general, but it does make one important point that might be addressed in our questionnaire. The authors stated that most faculty that used government documents approached them "through citations in the literature of the faculty members' own fields of study. This method was cited twice as often as any other method of locating documents..."(12). (CM).

Source: ERIC

Morrison, Perry D. "Since Bath: A Review of Published Information Transfer Studies in the Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1974 Through 1978." Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian 1 (Fall 1979): 5-22.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Information gathering habits; User needs.

Rank: 1

Comment: Abstract at beginning: "Massive projects from the University of Bath in the late 1960's brought knowledge of how scholars use social science information up to the level of similar knowledge for the natural sciences. Persistent themes of selected studies since

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bath include: Social, like natural, scientists tend to use private sources and informal networks rather than libraries; value of citation studies as guides to library collection building is disputed; machine access to social science data bases is increasing and is accepted but trained operators are required; social science research findings are reaching and influencing policy makers to a greater extent than previously thought" (5).

Source: ERIC

Osburn, Charles B. "Non-Use and Loser Studies in Collection Development." Collection Management 4 (Spring-Summer, 1982): 45-53.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Use studies

Rank: 5

Comment: Advocates creation of an "intelligence system for library administrators" that enables the library to know/discover community's needs. Nothing new here (it seems to me). He seems to recommend the type of research we're doing. (CM)

Source: --

Paisley, William J. The Flow of (Behavioral) Science Information: A Review of the Research Literature. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University, 1965.

Location: ILL; ERIC ED039783

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; Use studies

Rank: 3

Comment: This work reviews many studies "dealing with the information-gathering and -disseminating behavior of scientists..."(p. I-2). It also discusses studies of behavioral scientists, assuming that "information flows to and from behavioral scientists in much the same way that it flows to and from physical scientists..."(I-1). Some parts of this work that may be of interest: a chronological description of use studies, 1948-1965, by such researchers as Bernal, Shaw, Maizell, etc. (some 27 studies); a discussion about "information exchange among psychologists" through such channels as conference attendance, journals, etc.

It seems to me that for our project, the Bath study is much more relevant. Paisley's work is of interest primarily as background; it may be of interest historically, too, as an early study of information-gathering behavior in "soft" sciences as separate from "hard" sciences which had heretofore been the focus of such studies.

Source: --

Paisley, William J. "Information Needs and Uses." In Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, v. 3, pp. 1-30. Edited by Carlos A. Cuadra. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1968.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z699 .A1 A65 v. 3

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 3

Comment: "This review is anchored in 1967 studies of the information-gathering and information-disseminating behavior of scientists and technologists" (1). Addresses problems of defective methodology; states need for "a conceptual framework" for studying users' information requirements within "systems."

Sources: Ford, User Studies; Auster, "Organizational Behavior...."

Payne, Stanley. The Art of Asking Questions. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1951.

Location: Central LB1027 .P385

Subjects: Survey instrument design

Rank: 100 (2)

Comment: Concerns the proper wording of questions for surveys and advantages and disadvantages of certain types of questions (e.g. open-ended questions). Should be helpful as a guide when preparing questions for survey instruments. (CM)

Source: Bookstein, "On the Complexities of Asking Questions...."

Scholarly Communication: The Report of the National Enquiry. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z286 .S37 N37 1979

Subjects: User needs; Information gathering habits

Rank: 1

Comment: "Analyzes the various sectors of scholarly communication, scholarly journals, books and presses, and research libraries, with emphasis upon the humanities and the social sciences" (Godden, Collection Development, p. 20). Would be helpful to see Janet D. Griffith, "The Survey of Scholars: Relationships between the Scholars and Other Estates" (Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Research Triangle Institute, Feb. 1978)--this report is unpublished. It is cited on p. 131 and p. 167 of Scholarly Communication. (CM)

Source: Godden, Collection Development, p. 20

Sell, Betty. "An Evaluative, Holistic, and User-Oriented Approach to Assessing and Monitoring Effectiveness of the Academic Library in Its Setting." In Library Effectiveness: A State of the Art, pp. 295-336. New York: Library Administration and Management Assoc./ALA, 1980.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z678.85 .L52 1980

Subjects: User needs; Questionnaires

Rank: 2

Comment: Faculty questionnaire reproduced in appendix. (CM)

Source: --

Skelton, Barbara. "Scientists and Social Scientists as Information Users: A Comparison of Results of Science User Studies With the Investigation into Information Requirements of the Social Sciences." Journal of Librarianship 5 (April 1973): 138-156.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Information gathering habits

Rank: 2

Comment: ERIC abstract: "Scientists and social scientists do not differ to any large extent in their information seeking behavior. However, the extent of use of different methods and the degrees of problems created do vary and account for the differences in the information seeking behavior of scientists and social scientists." Skelton also draws a "generalized profile" of "a social scientist as an information user." (CM)

Source: ERIC

Stenstrom, Patricia, and McBride, Ruth B. "Serial Use by Social Science Faculty: A Survey." College & Research Libraries 40 (September 1979): 426-31.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Use studies

Rank: 1

Comment: Study shows that "faculty used the library as a supplementary, not primary, source for serials" (Godden, Collection Development, p. 37). Article goes on to tell what primary sources were. Important list of references at end of article. Photocopied list on file. (CM)

Source: Godden, Collection Development, p. 37

Stieg, Margaret F. "The Information Needs of Historians." College & Research Libraries 42 (November 1981): 549-60.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: User satisfaction; User needs; Information gathering habits

Rank: 1

Comments: Survey results include "information on the formats from which" historians get information, "where they find relevant references . . ." (Stieg, p. 549). Survey questionnaire used many of the same questions asked by Bath University group (Bath study photocopied and on file). Detailed discussion of survey, although instrument not reproduced. (CM)

Source: --

Stoan, Stephen K. "Research and Library Skills: An Analysis and Interpretation." College & Research Libraries 45 (March 1984): 99-109.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Information-gathering habits.

Rank: 1

Comment: "This study examines the source of misunderstandings between librarians and teaching faculty over the concepts of library use and of research, concluding that library skills and research skills, being predicted on divergent philosophies of information seeking, are essentially different things that can be, and usually are, learned in isolation from each other. It goes on to discuss some possible implications of these findings with regard to bibliographic instruction and to some other library policies." (Abstract from beginning of article, p. 99)

Source: --

Stone, Sue. "Humanities Scholars: Information Needs and Uses." Journal of Documentation 38 (December 1982): 292-313.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 2

Comment: An interesting article summarizing the information-gathering habits of humanists as they have been described in several studies by many different researchers. Among the several points covered in this article, Stone finds that humanists tend to work alone (they rarely form the "invisible colleges" common to scientists); they tend not "to delegate literature searching"(294-95); they need to browse "which provides a means of serendipitous interaction with the materials of research"(295). She goes on to discuss more specific sources of information, too, such as bibliographies, indexes, abstracts, databases, etc. Article includes a very good list of references of humanities information-gathering research. (CM).

Source: --

Use of Library Materials: The University of Pittsburgh Study. Edited by Allen Kent et al. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1979.

Location: Lib. Sci. Z675 .U5 U83

Subjects: Use studies

Rank: 6

Comment: Study determined the extent to which library materials were used. Relates mostly to determining cost, and these results used in selection. (CM)

Source: --

Weintraub, Karl J. "The Humanistic Scholar and the Library." Library Quarterly 50 (January 1980): 22-39.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: Information-gathering habits; User needs

Rank: 5

Comment: An interesting discussion of the research needs of humanists (particularly historians). It may be worth reading if one hasn't had the opportunity to read other materials on humanists' interests. Otherwise, this article doesn't seem to add anything new. (CM).

Source: Godden, Collection Development.

Wilson, Kathryn B., and Eustis, Joanne D. "The Impact of User Frustration on Humanities Research." College & Research Libraries 42 (July 1981): 361-65.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: User satisfaction; User needs; Information gathering habits

Rank: 1

Comment: Describes methodology and survey instrument. The study focuses on "alternatives that a researcher might choose when encountering weaknesses in the library collection" (p. 362).

Source: --

Wilson, T. D. "On User Studies and Information Needs." Journal of Documentation 37 (March 1981): 3-15.

Location: Lib. Sci. Per.

Subjects: User needs; Use studies

Rank: 1

Comment: Theoretical study of information needs. (CM) From introduction to article: "Apart from information retrieval there is virtually no other area of information science that has occasioned as much research effort and writing as 'user studies'. Within user studies the investigation of 'information needs' has been the subject of much debate and no little confusion. The aim of this paper is to attempt to reduce this confusion by devoting attention to the definition of some concepts and by proposing the basis for a theory of the motivations for information-seeking behavior" (p. 3).

Source: --

INDEX

Accidental discovery V-14
Acknowledgments Preface-6

Background information Abstract-1
Background of the study Preface-1
Books, personal collections IV-1
Borrowing from other libraries V-8

Citation index III-11
Conference attendance VII-3
Conferences, value of VII-5
Contacts with colleagues VII-1
Convenience of use III-4

Dates of publication, books and periodicals V-17
Delay in publication III-13
Difficulty of use III-4

Format and use Summary-5
Further study, suggestions for Summary-8

General information needs Abstract-2, III-1

Heard Library V-1

Ideas for research, sources of VII-6
Informal sources Abstract-6, VII-1, Summary-3
Information, kinds used in research II-17

Journal subscriptions, personal IV-4
Journal, dominance of Summary-4

Languages read VI-1
Languages used VI-4
Languages used in research Abstract-5, VI-1
Languages, effect on choice of research topic VI-7
Languages, low level of use Summary-6
Languages, references to other VI-5
Librarians in the research process Summary-6
Library tools, value of V-12
Library use Abstract-4, V-1

Methodology for the study Preface-2
Methods of discoveriang references III-8
Methods of exchanging information VII-1
Microforms III-1

Non-book materials III-11

Organization (of study document) Preface-5

Peabody College faculty I-5
Peabody College faculty, ages I-11
Peabody College faculty, dates of degrees and employment I-11
Peabody College faculty, ranks I-14
Peabody College faculty, survey results I-7
Peabody College faculty, time allocation I-15
Peabody College, brief profile I-1
Peabody College, degrees offered I-2
Peabody College, departments I-2
Peabody College, history I-1
Personal file maintenance IV-7
Personal information resources Abstract-3, IV-1
Printed materials, reliance on Summary-4

Research information needs Abstract-2, II-1
Research products II-1
Research, delegation of VII-8
Research, facilitation of III-14
Research, raw materials II-15

Sources of materials V-9
Survey, final comments on Summary-8

Textual note Preface-6
Timeliness of publication III-13

Vanderbilt library system V-1
Vanderbilt library, adequacy of V-8
Vanderbilt library, problems in use V-10
Vanderbilt library, use of V-5